

Weekly Compilation of
**Presidential
Documents**



Monday, March 21, 1994
Volume 30—Number 11
Pages 505–565

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

- Anti-violence public service announcements—550
- Bosnian Federation signing ceremony—558
- Boston, MA
 - New England Presidential dinner—521
 - Rowes Wharf—519
- Celebration of Ireland dinner—555
- Detroit, MI
 - Detroit Diesel—516
 - Focus: HOPE—507
 - Group of Seven jobs conference—508
- Fort Drum, NY, soldiers and their families—539
- New Hampshire
 - Markem Corporation employees in Keene—537
 - Town meeting in Nashua—526
- Radio address—505
- St. Patrick's Day ceremony—552

Appointments and Nominations

- See also* Statements by the President
- African Development Foundation, Chair—550
- Federal Communications Commission, Commissioner—542
- Voice of America, Director—549

Bill Signings

- Highway bridge retrofitting and replacement legislation—557

Communications to Congress

- International agreements, letter transmitting report—541

Communications to Congress—Continued

- “Reemployment Act of 1994,” message transmitting—542

Communications to Federal Agencies

- Sanctions against Serbia and Montenegro—549
- White House conference on small business—542

Executive Orders

- Commission for Environmental Cooperation, Commission for Labor Cooperation, Border Environment Cooperation Commission, and North American Development Bank—550

Interviews With the News Media

- Exchanges with reporters
 - Boston, MA—518
 - Detroit, MI—508
 - Nashua, NH—536
 - Roosevelt Room—552
- News conference with Prime Minister Rabin of Israel, March 16 (No. 53)—544

Letters and Messages

- See also* Resignations and Retirements
- St. Patrick's Day—556

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

- European leaders, Bosnian Federation signing ceremony—558
- Group of Seven ministers—508
- Ireland, Prime Minister Reynolds—552, 555
- Israel, Prime Minister Rabin—544

(Continued on the inside back cover.)

Contents—Continued

Proclamations

- National Agriculture Day—562

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

Published every Monday by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC 20408, the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* contains statements, messages, and other Presidential materials released by the White House during the preceding week.

The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* is published pursuant to the authority contained in the Federal Register Act (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C. Ch. 15), under

regulations prescribed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, approved by the President (37 FR 23607; 1 CFR Part 10).

Distribution is made only by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* will be furnished by mail to domestic subscribers for \$80.00 per year (\$137.00 for mailing first class) and to foreign subscribers for \$93.75 per year, payable to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The charge for a single copy is \$3.00 (\$3.75 for foreign mailing).

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents*.

Associate Attorney General, letter—525

Statements by the President

See also Appointments and Nominations; Bill Signings

Earthquake assistance to California—561

House of Representatives action on the budget—505

Statements by the President—Continued

Nomination of Admiral Jeremy M. Boorda to be Chief of Naval Operations—525

Statements Other Than Presidential

President's telephone conversations with President Hafiz al-Asad of Syria and King Hussein of Jordan—562

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—565

Checklist of White House press releases—564

Digest of other White House announcements—563

Nominations submitted to the Senate—564

Week Ending Friday, March 18, 1994

Statement on the House of Representatives Action on Budget Legislation

March 11, 1994

I commend the House for passing our budget. This budget continues to bring down the deficit and makes needed investments in our people and in our economy. Our commitment to fiscal discipline and targeted investments is paying off in strong economic growth and job creation. Working together, the Congress and this administration are building a stronger economy for today and a future of opportunity for our children.

NOTE: This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

The President's Radio Address

March 12, 1994

Good morning. This morning I want to talk with you about what we're doing here at home and abroad to create better jobs for our American workers and about a breakthrough we've had in our trade talks with Japan.

Let me begin with this important news. Today we've reached an agreement that will open up Japan's cellular telephone market to high-technology products made here in America. This is a big win for everyone. Workers in the United States will gain because the agreement means more demand for cellular telephones and related equipment made in America. Japanese consumers win because they'll have access to better service and better technology at better prices. Even Japanese manufacturers may win because of the increased demand for cellular telephones. This agreement is designed to produce results; both countries will be able to measure progress. And it demonstrates that the United States and Japan can work together to open up jobs in America by open-

ing up markets in Japan in ways that help both Americans and Japanese.

Our trade negotiations with Japan are just one example of the challenges and opportunities that face us in this new global economy. That's why tomorrow I'll join leaders of the world's seven major industrial nations in Detroit for a conference on creating more and better jobs for our people.

For two decades, all these wealthy countries have struggled to protect the jobs of our working people and to create new jobs in an extremely competitive and rapidly changing global economy. None of us has had the success we would like. That's why I asked for this meeting. But remember this: Of all the advanced nations, America is doing the best job of creating new jobs, and we should be proud. After 12 years of drift, we were able to get the deficit and interest rates and inflation down and to get productivity and investments in growth up. As a result, our economy has generated 2 million new jobs in a little more than a year, and 90 percent of them are in the private sector. And if we stay with our program when it comes to jobs, there will be 2 million more in 1994.

But we can't rest on this record. Too many Americans haven't yet felt the benefits of recovery. Too many middle class Americans are still working harder for the same or lower wages. And too many lack the education and training they need to prosper in today's competitive environment.

Our trading partners all have similar problems. Advanced nations are experiencing chronic unemployment and stagnant wages. Powerful new technologies and global communications have created the most competitive world markets ever, and we must compete and win in it.

These are very serious problems. They require new ways of thinking, and no nation has all the answers. But all of us are trying, and we all have something to learn from each

other. That is the purpose of the conference in Detroit.

In Detroit, I will reaffirm my belief that the global economy is not an obstacle to progress but a great opportunity for us. We can't build walls around our nations and refuse to compete. Turning inward won't change the world or improve our jobs. Preparing for change and embracing change, however, and using it to create more high-wage jobs will do what we want to do. That is our goal. And here's how we plan to do it:

First, we'll continue to expand trade in open markets around the world. International trade is an engine for growth that creates jobs, that lifts wages. That's why we've signed more trade agreements and lowered more trade barriers this year than in any recent memory. Our commitment to opening new markets to American goods is unshakable.

Second, we must invest to develop new technologies and products like the information superhighway or new technologies for dual use in both defense and civilian markets. And we'll continue to demonstrate that protecting the environment can be good for the economy. For example, there are hundreds of thousands of good jobs in producing clean cars and alternative fuels, and we believe those jobs should be American jobs. Sound fiscal policies at home, opening markets abroad, investing in the technologies of the future, that's how to create more high-wage jobs.

The final piece of this puzzle is to invest in the education and skills of our people so they are prepared to fill those jobs. That's why we've already invested more in getting our children off to a good start in Head Start, in the Women's, Infant, and Children Nutrition programs. That's why we've already reformed the student loan program so that all children, including children of the middle class, can afford to go to college by borrowing money at lower interest rates and paying it off as a percentage of their incomes after they get jobs. That's why, just a few days ago, I asked Congress to discard the old unemployment and training program, which is too big, too old, and too slow, and replace it with a system to retrain our workers quickly for

the high-skilled jobs of tomorrow and to link them to those jobs within weeks, not months or years.

We're pushing Congress hard to pass a safe schools act, to reduce violence in our schools and to make our children safer on the streets on the way to school. Congress now is finishing work on our Goals 2000 education bill, which will establish world-class standards for educational excellence and on our school-to-work initiative, which will allow our young people who don't go to college to get the skills they need to find good jobs. Each of these important measures stands a good chance of becoming law, many in just a matter of weeks.

Meeting this challenge head-on is never easy. Change is always difficult. But these are things we have to do and something we've proved we can do. Our economic policies have sparked a real recovery and begun to put our economic house in order. The Congress seems determined to continue working with me this year. Just yesterday, the House of Representatives, in record time, okayed our new budget. If it passes the whole Congress we will have 3 consecutive years of declining deficits for the first time since Harry Truman was President.

Our trade policies continue to open markets in ways that will boost exports, create jobs, and share the benefits of growth. We can defeat any obstacle to change, we can create millions of high-wage jobs for our people, if we have the courage to confront our problems boldly, not to be diverted or deterred, and we make a commitment to solving these problems together.

That will be my message to all the nations gathered this Monday in Detroit, and it is my commitment to all of you hearing this broadcast today.

Thank you for listening.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:06 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A table listing education, training, and reemployment legislative priorities for the 2d Session, 103d Congress was attached to the release.

Remarks at Focus: HOPE in Detroit, Michigan

March 13, 1994

Thank you so much, Father, Eleanor, Donald, ladies and gentlemen, for welcoming me here and introducing me to Focus: HOPE. I have met your ambassadors to the world, Father Cunningham, and Donald is a great ambassador for you. Where did he go? Is he hiding? You would have been so proud of him in Washington, speaking about you to the whole country. He was terrific. Thank you, Congresswoman Collins, for welcoming me and my good friend Senator Levin. I think if I had not come here to Focus: HOPE, he never would have cast a single vote for me again in the United States—[laughter]. You know, all of us are obsessed by something or another in life; it's a good thing to be obsessed by something good and noble. Carl Levin is obsessed with Focus: HOPE, in the best possible way.

The best tribute I can think of is to look around this room. We have two United States Senators, Governor Engler, Mayor Archer, all these Congressmen here, Chairman Dingell, Congressman Conyers, Congressman Barcia, Congressman Bonior, Congressman Kildee, Congressman Sandy Levin—I think that's everybody. And then we have the Secretary of Labor, Bob Reich, and the Secretary of Commerce, Ron Brown, which represent two of the three Departments, along with the Department of Defense, that have made direct investments in Focus: HOPE. This is a great tribute to this work. But the most important thing I want to say to you is that you heard Donald read the creed of Focus: HOPE, which was forged 26 years ago this week, on March 8th, 1968, and it sounds as if it could have been written yesterday, doesn't it?

I guess I have spent as much time in manufacturing facilities of various sorts as any person who ever occupied the Presidency, because I was a Governor for 12 years, I had to do that. I have never been in a place as advanced, as upbeat, as hopeful as this place. And I can tell you, when we were pulling in here today, I was talking to Senator Riegle and Senator Levin—we were in the car together—and Carl looked at me, and he said,

“This is what you ran for President to do, “focus hope.” This is what you wanted to bring to the entire country. You are going in to see why you wanted to be President of the United States.”

I think all of you know that I am here, along with the leaders of six of the other world's great industrial powers, to talk about the jobs crisis in the advanced economies. In every wealthy country now, there is difficulty creating new jobs. The United States has the lowest unemployment rate of all the so-called G-7 advanced industrial nations. In every advanced economy now, there are problems rewarding work with higher wages year-in and year-out, and many, many people are stuck with wages that do not go up, even when they work harder. And we are looking for answers to unlock this. We're looking for ways that we can work together to create more opportunity for people like you.

But you know and I know that no matter what policies we pursue in Washington or around the world, unless people are trained, unless they have a skill that enables them to compete and win in the global economy, to produce a high-quality, world-class product or service, nothing the Government can do will make any difference. What you are doing is guaranteeing America's security here and America's future by guaranteeing your own.

I want you to be proud of that. I also want everybody in America to see you. Here we are, in an inner-city neighborhood, with building after building of plants that were closed down, which could have become a symbol for the loss of hope, which could have become yet another excuse for why people can't make it if they are poor or if they are minorities or if they are women or if they've been on welfare or if this or if that or if the other thing. And instead of saying if, this is a place that says when: When you work, when you learn, you can do, you can have a future.

And this makes the point, for all the problems with this world that we're living in, if you know how to do something and you're good at it, no one can take that away from you, and you can be rewarded for that. And you have proven if those skills can be acquired and that talent can be demonstrated, without regard to race or gender or income

or background, if only we will give everybody a chance and invest in the future of the American people, this model here could be seen sweeping across America if we had the kind of local leadership that is manifest here by the stunning examples of Father Cunningham and Eleanor Josaitis and if we had the kind of help you've had here from the private sector to work with Government in a partnership. There is not enough Government money in the world to create these opportunities without a partnership. But if we can do this here, we can do it anywhere. And if here, if here you can be the best in the world, then America can be the best in the world everywhere. That is our mission, all of us, to be that.

I just want you to know that I got a lot more out of seeing you today than you did out of seeing me. I got fresh, clear, strong evidence to prove what I have always believed, that if we could get rid of all these hangups we've got in this country, if we could stop majoring in the minors and minoring in the majors and start thinking about what is really important, if we could really believe that all people are created equal and that people can do anything, if we could remember that the purpose of coming together is to get people together to share beliefs, to share convictions, and to get things done, then we would be able to revolutionize this whole country. If it can happen in these few square blocks of Detroit, my fellow Americans, can it not happen throughout our country? I believe it can.

So I want you to know you have inspired me, and I will talk about you all across this country. I remember I used to say, when I was running for President, because of the little town that I was born in, that I still believed in a place called Hope. And now I can say I also believe in a place called Focus: HOPE.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:39 p.m. at the Advance Technology Center. In his remarks, he referred to Father William Cunningham, director; Eleanor Josaitis, associate director; and Donald Hutchinson, student, Focus: HOPE.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Group of Seven Ministers in Detroit

March 14, 1994

Interest Rates

Q. Mr. President, do you think rising interest rates are hurting the U.S. economic recovery?

The President. I don't think we can say that for sure yet. They were bound to go up some after the fourth quarter growth figure came in; we had the highest growth rate in a decade. But I think that since there's no inflation in the economy, interest rates should not continue to go up. We'll see. If they moderate, tail off, then we'll be all right.

China

Q. Is the U.S., Mr. President, backing away from its human rights stand in terms of MFN for China?

The President. I was disappointed at the results of the meeting with the Secretary of State. And our policy is the same. We'll just have to wait and see what happens between now and June. I'll make a judgment at the appropriate time.

NOTE: The exchange began at 9:25 a.m. at the Westin Hotel. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks at the Group of Seven Jobs Conference in Detroit

March 14, 1994

Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President, for your remarks and your wonderful service and for your commitment to this project. The Vice President will be here for the entire day and a half, working with the distinguished ministers from other countries as well as our own Cabinet members and other leaders here in America.

I want to thank the State of Michigan and the congressional delegation and the city of Detroit. You know, it is true that the Mayor runs faster in the morning than the President and the Vice President do. [*Laughter*] He took us out to Belle Isle; I made him quit after 3 miles. And if that weren't enough indignity, I got back to the hotel room, and

I read the newspaper and discovered that in the NCAA basketball championships, my beloved Arkansas basketball team has been paired with Michigan in the Midwest regionals. The only thing I can say is they are in much better shape than I am, Mayor. [Laughter]

I want to say how wonderful it is for me to be back here in this magnificent theater, which represents the cultural richness and the indomitable spirit of this wonderful city. I want to thank Michael and Marion Ilitch for restoring this theater and for doing so much else for downtown historical—[ap-*plause*].

I am delighted that the ministers of the G-7 nations and representatives of the European Union have come here to America's industrial heartland for this important meeting at an historic and hopeful time. In some nations, people are pessimistic. And in all nations, some people are pessimistic, and in all nations, there are people with difficulties. But there is real cause for hope. Technology that was once the province of science fiction now fills our factories, our schools, and our homes. Nations that once aimed missiles at each other now cooperate not only here on Earth but also in space. Jobs that challenged the mind instead of straining the back are now within reach of virtually all the people who live in these nations.

For the past half-century, our great common endeavors, from containing communism to defeating aggression in the Persian Gulf, to expanding world trade to promoting democracy in the former Soviet Union and helping to solve the tragic conflict in Bosnia, all have depended on common bonds among the countries present here today. I asked for the conference to summon the same collective energy and intellect and ideas and experience to one of the greatest problems of our era: The challenge of creating and maintaining a high-wage, high-growth society in mature, industrial countries confronted by the challenges of a global economy.

In different ways, every advanced nation faces a stubborn, persistent problem of jobs and incomes. Some are having difficulty creating new jobs; others are having difficulty lifting their people's incomes. In the United States, we have created a lot of new jobs in

the last two decades. But for almost two decades now, the wages of hourly workers in America have remained virtually stagnant. The average American worker is working a longer work week than 20 years ago for about the same income.

None of us has all the answers. We are here because we have something to learn from each other and, hopefully, something to teach each other. We can all do better, and if we work together, it is certain that all of our people will do better.

For the first time, this conference brings together our ministers of finance, labor, commerce, and economics. We know that the riddle of job creation cannot be solved entirely by low interest rates or better training policies or high tech investment alone, but we need these. Some of the ministers told me that if we can get the finance ministers and labor ministers within each country to talk to each other, we will have made a real step forward. There's no better place to address these challenges than here, in this city, this State, and this region. They tell us not only that we must change but that we can.

When I was growing up in Arkansas, many of the people that I knew and lived with were farmers. Almost no one my age can go back more than one generation in my State without having a farmer in his or her family. But as agriculture mechanized and more and more people were thrown off the farms, literally hundreds of thousands of people were forced to leave the farm. Many of them came to places like Detroit for jobs in the factory. When I campaigned in Michigan 2 years ago, I realized I actually had a chance to be elected President when one of three democratic primary voters I met in Michigan was born in Arkansas. [Laughter]

That is the pattern of America. For most of this century, the industrial Midwest symbolized economic opportunity. People thrown off the farm in the rural areas could come here and expect to find, without regard to their race or their educational level before they got here or their income before they got here, a job which would permit them to support their families, take a vacation, have health care, send their kids to college, live in their own home, and have a decent retirement when they finish. That was the great

hope and promise of Detroit, of Chicago, of this whole regional mecca that led the industrial revolution of America.

Industrial America was hit hard by economic changes, which all of you know as well or better than I. But I have watched the people of this region fight back. A few years ago, people said the American automobile industry was doomed. But the Big Three auto companies worked hard with their partners in labor to improve quality, safety, and fuel efficiency. Now they are regaining market share at home and abroad. They are back. For the past dozen years Michigan has made the journey to a new economy; small and mid-sized companies here have created nearly 400,000 manufacturing and industrial service jobs. The British magazine, the Economist, calls Automation Alley, the 40-mile corridor between Detroit and Ann Arbor, and I quote, "the fastest growing technology corridor in the entire United States of America."

And yet, let us not be too Pollyanna about this, with all the good news there's also the continuing challenge. Too many people have been left behind. And that was the challenge that I think brought this fine young Mayor to the mayor's job here and is bringing so many of you together across party and racial and income and background lines to try to figure out how we can unlock the human potential of all of our people.

This morning, I want to begin by introducing you to eight extraordinary people throughout the Midwest who exemplify the changes that we must all make—and I want to ask them to stand up when I call their names—because it is important for all of us in public life never to forget that there are real lives behind the actions we take and the mistakes we make as well as the things we do right.

Anna Satur—where are you, Anna? Stand up. They should all be down here. She's not here? If you are here, you stand up when I call you. Steve Choate. I know he's here, I saw him yesterday. Stand up, Steve. Don't sit down. Steve Choate is a near neighbor of mine. He started out as a janitor, and he's now a plant manager for Megavolt in Springfield, Missouri, part of an employee-owned company that practices, and I quote, "open-book management, sharing its financial fig-

ures with its workers and asking their help in planning new products." Debbie Colloton started as a machine operator, took advanced training, and became the quality control officer of Rockford Process Control, a metal assemblies maker in Rockford, Illinois. Bruce Wirtanen founded Waterworks America. I met him yesterday, and he gave me one of his products. He never stopped selling. [Laughter] In North Royalton, Ohio, they make crystals that save water in places like Saudi Arabia, where water is more expensive than oil. Kathy Price, of Chicago, learned new skills at the Martin Luther King Community Services Center and moved from welfare to work as a programmer analyst. Frank Rapley is the superintendent of the Kalamazoo, Michigan, public schools, where they help young people who are not going to college move from school to work. Harold Wright learned new skills in heating and air conditioning after he lost his factory job right here in Detroit, and now he's an instructor for the International Union of Operating Engineers. And Ocelia Williams—I saw her—is a lead person and metal slitter operator at the Cin-Made Corporation in Cincinnati, Ohio, a unionized company with profit sharing and self-directed work teams.

All these people have been forced to change to do well in the global economy. But they are your friends and neighbors, and there are millions of them like them not only here but in every one of the G-7 nations here represented. We are here to help them find new ways to create new jobs, better jobs, and better opportunities for their families. And we dare not let them down. Thank you very much.

Let us begin by recognizing the fundamental reality that private enterprise, not Government action, is the engine of economic growth and job creation. Our vision of the good society depends as much on a thriving private sector as anything else. Let us also recognize that there are things that Government can and should do, give our private sector the tools to grow and prepare our people for the jobs of the new economy.

A big thing that we'll be discussing here in the next 2 days is what the responsibility of the Government is and what must be done in the private sector and how we can rec-

oncile the two better than any of us has done in the past. Here in the United States, I think we are moving in the right direction. Our economy has produced 2.1 million jobs in 13 months, and 90 percent of them are in the private sector.

In the 1980's, a lot of the net new job growth in America was in the government sector, mostly at the State and local level. These new jobs are coming in the private sector. But too many middle class people are working harder for less, and too many people in America are still unemployed. Too many lack the training to prosper in the competitive environment, and there are too many areas where there is simply no new private investment, especially in large sections of inner cities and isolated rural areas.

The growing gap in incomes between the skilled and unskilled threatens not only the strength of our economies in these countries but also the very fabric of our democratic societies. A year ago, for example, unemployment in America was 12.6 percent for people with no high school diploma, 7.2 percent for high school graduates, 5.7 percent for people with advanced training, and 3.5 percent for college graduates. And unemployment, as I said before, is also highest in places where people are isolated from investment opportunities, principally in our large inner cities and our poorest rural areas.

All of us, in our own way, must face these fundamental challenges: to find new ways to equip people to succeed, harnessing the dynamism of the marketplace, and somehow finding a way to bring those forces into the areas where people have been left behind. I have to say that here in the United States, I sometimes think we do a better job in giving people incentives to invest in some of our trading partners that are developing economies than we do in some of our inner cities and isolated rural areas that are also developing economies where we have opportunities to grow.

We all know that a global economy is taking shape where information and investment move across national lines at stunning speed, competing for jobs and incomes. For economies at the cutting edge, there is no place to hide. Rapidly developing nations strive to improve their living standards by showing

that they can do what we do just as well at lower costs. As the old era gives way to the new, our nations face a clear and crucial choice at the very outset. Are we going to hunker down and build walls of protection and suffer a slow and steady decline in our living standards, or are we going to embrace eagerly the challenges of this new economy, create high-wage jobs, and prepare people to fill them?

Every advanced economy is now facing that choice in many different ways, a choice between hope and fear, between stagnation and change, between closing up and opening up. If we ever needed evidence that we should choose change and that we can, I received that evidence yesterday when I visited Focus: HOPE here in Detroit, where I saw people from the inner city being trained for world-class jobs, getting world-class jobs, and able to compete.

America has chosen the path of change. We have seen, among other things, these other countries in the G-7. All of our guests here today—my fellow Americans, you need to know that they used to meet once a year, and every time they met for 10 years, the G-7 nations passed a resolution that was, frankly, embarrassing to the United States. They did it in very polite language, but they essentially said the global economy cannot grow if America continues to expand its budget deficit, every year spending more and more money than the taxpayers are paying in. They said, "Please, America, do something about your deficit." And so we did.

By cutting the deficit by \$500 billion, we now have a deficit that is a smaller percentage of our annual income than all but one of our other G-7 nations here represented today. And I'm proud of that. And if the Congress adopts the new budget, as they seem on the way to doing, we will have 3 years of reduction in our deficit for the first time since Harry Truman was President. So we are moving in the right direction.

You need to know that our nations here have adopted a strategy that recognizes that each of the great blocs here have a role to play, that the United States should continue to bring its deficit down, that Japan should increase domestic demand, that Europe should continue to work for lower interest

rates, so that these three things together can spark a new round of worldwide growth which will create more economic activity and more jobs in the European countries, here in North America with the United States and Canada, and in Japan.

We're also working hard together to tear down trade barriers with NAFTA, GATT, a meeting with the Asian-Pacific countries. Last year, we did a generation's work of worth in supporting global growth and jobs and incomes through increased trade.

During the debate on NAFTA, we heard the concerns of working people—legitimate concerns—who were vulnerable to changes in the economy and don't believe that any of these changes will benefit them. But we had to face the simple truth: Export-related jobs in the United States pay on average 22 percent more than jobs having nothing to do with the global economy. And trade is not a zero-sum game. If the world economy declines, we all lose, and when it grows, we all win.

One lesson is clear: There is no rich country on Earth that can expand its own job base and its incomes unless there is global economic growth. In the absence of that growth, poorer countries doing the same thing we do for wages our people can't live on will chip away at our position. When there is a lot of growth you can be developing new technologies, new activities, and new markets. That is our only option.

We also, therefore, must create those new markets. That means we have to be investing in job-creating technologies, from dual-use military and civilian technologies as we reduce defense spending, to an information superhighway connecting every classroom and library in the country.

Many of these technologies will be in the environmental area. We now know for sure it is possible to protect the environment and promote the economy. Together with the Big Three auto companies and United Auto-workers, we're promoting clean cars that will cause less pollution and create more markets. From Theodore Roosevelt to Walter Ruther to our own distinguished Vice President, our wisest leaders have always cared about both our workers and our environment. And we

aim to prove that that's a big ticket to new jobs in the 21st century.

Now, what are the obstacles to change? Here in the heartland and throughout the industrial world too many people have worked hard only to see their incomes stagnate or decline. We have to restore confidence in people that if they do acquire the skills they need and help their countries move forward, they'll be rewarded and not punished. These ingrained political, almost psychological barriers to change have to be addressed in every country.

I'll be candid with you. One of the things that I hope will come out of this G-7 meeting is that by talking together openly and honestly about the problems of growth and sharing our common experiences each of us who are leaders in our countries will be able to do more within our own countries because we'll be able to say, "See, the Germans and the French and the Canadians and the Italians and the Japanese, well, we all have the same problems."

We have talked about that a lot around our breakfast table this morning. And everybody made the same observation, that if we can just honestly debate these problems, we can help people overcome their fears of change and still recognize that there are some legitimate concerns associated with these changes going on.

This conference, I think, must address three critical problems that discourage people from supporting change. Unless people believe they are prepared for the jobs of the future, that productivity benefits them, and they can have both strong work lives and strong families in a dynamic economy, they will turn against change. We have to reassure our constituents in all these countries on all those points. Our first challenge is obvious, preparing our people for a world of work that offers high wages but demands high skills.

When I address audiences of young people, I tell them they will probably change jobs seven or eight times in a lifetime. That's why we're moving forward with a lifelong learning agenda in Congress and why Congress is preparing to pass bills establishing world-class educational standards, promoting grassroots reform, helping to facilitate the movement of people who go from high

school into the workplace and who don't go on to college.

Learning must never stop. We've got an unemployment system today tied to an economy that hasn't existed for over 10 years, an unemployment that assumes that if you just give people enough to live on, they will be called back to their old job. Well, the truth is most people aren't called back to their old job today. When they lose a job today it's not because of some cyclical regular downturn in the economy, it's often because there has been another structural change in the world economy, and what used to be done by a person in America is now being done by a machine in America or by a person somewhere else. So that person has to find something new to do. That means it is wrong to charge employers an unemployment tax, to put it in a trust fund to pay people when they are unemployed, to hang around until the unemployment runs out when they still won't have a job. That is not right.

So, last week we presented a plan to turn our unemployment system into a reemployment system, to consolidate all these training programs, create one-stop career centers, and start people training and preparing for new jobs from the day they lose their old jobs.

This is a big problem in many industrial countries. The length of time people are unemployed is growing longer and longer, and very often because they don't get training they are forced to take a new job at a lower wage than the old job they lost. We can change this, and in so doing, we can make our people feel more secure about embracing the changes of the global economy. And besides, it's good business. We need all our people right now. We shouldn't be paying for people to be idle when we could be paying for them to work. It's not good business.

Yesterday, as I said, when I went to Focus: Hope, I saw young people who were learning advanced jobs in engineering, robotics, other fields of the future, proving once again that all people can learn. I met a man the other day from northern New York, who had worked in the defense industry for 29 years and is now an executive in a hospital, because he was given the chance to learn a new skill and given the chance to be hired by an em-

ployer not blinded by age bias. We have too much age bias in this country on both—[ap-*plause*]. We have people that won't hire kids because they don't have any experience. How are they ever going to get any experience if they don't get a job, right? Then we have people who won't hire older people because they've got too much experience. Let me tell you, the older I get, the more I believe this, so I think I can say this with great passion, the fastest growing group of Americans today are people over 80. People who follow sensible habits are going to be very vigorous well into their 70's, able to work, able to contribute, able to do things. If people are going to lose their jobs throughout a lifetime, if we are going to have to change jobs eight times in a lifetime, a lot of people will have to change jobs into their 50's, even into their 60's. They cannot be denied the opportunity to contribute. If you want people to embrace change, we all have to change our attitudes about who is employable and especially on each end of the age spectrum. This is a very, very important thing. The issue should be, are people prepared for the jobs that are opening up? And if they are, they should be given a chance to do them.

The second challenge we face is one we talked about a lot at breakfast this morning. And the representative from the European Union from Greece made a very passionate comment about this. We have got to make our people believe that productivity can be a source of gain, not pain. And here is the trick. Productivity on the farm when I was a boy meant people lost jobs on the farm, right? But productivity in Detroit meant that more jobs were created in the automobile industry than were lost on the farm. Throughout the whole 20th century, ever since the Industrial Revolution, every time we had productivity in one area that meant that fewer people could do more work in that area, technological changes were always creating more jobs in another area.

Now, that is still true today, but the problem is there has been an explosion of productivity in manufacturing. It's not stopping. And now it's in the service industry, so that banks, for example, or insurance companies or you name it can do more work with fewer people because of information productivity. And at

the same time, all these other countries are able to do things that they were not formerly able to do. So in our countries, there is this great insecurity that productivity, for the first time, may be a job threat, not a job creator.

We have to fight that. Because last year we saw our companies here in America begin to rebound—13 months, 2.1 million jobs. And I promise you they would not have been there had it not been for increasing productivity in the private sector. We cannot turn away from the notion that modernization is the key to employment. The trick is for us in Government and people in the private sector to keep finding new areas in which productivity can succeed. Therefore, even though we're cutting back on Government spending this year, for example, we're spending a lot more money to try to give funds to defense contractors to figure out how they can use the technologies we all paid for to win the cold war, to win the post-cold-war era, in new technologies for new jobs for the future.

That is the trick. We've got to prove to our people that change can work for them and that increasing productivity is still the key to jobs and growth. If we forget that, if we allow our fears to blind us to the fact that we must always be on the side of productivity, we're going to be in real trouble. That's what created the middle class. The ability to do more per worker created the American middle class. It created the economic miracles in Europe and Japan after World War II. It will still create opportunity. It just is going to be different and more challenging and more complicated and more rapidly moving than before. But if we allow ourselves for a minute to try to resist the growth of productivity, we are in deep trouble.

From 1947 to 1973, productivity grew by over 3 percent a year in America, and wages grew at the same rate. Since then, the growth of productivity has slowed down and so have wages. Productivity is now coming back in many sectors of our economy, and as it does, jobs and wages will improve. Because we need to work smarter and not harder, this issue is more important than ever before.

Today, the United States Senate is debating a bill to help business conduct research and development to create manufacturing

centers where businesses can work together as smaller manufacturers have been doing in northern Italy, for example, for quite a long time now, to help put new technologies in the hands of companies that can use them, even though on their own, they wouldn't have the money to develop them. These are the kinds of things that all nations must do to keep their own people on the side of productivity and to keep our own economies going.

There will always be restructurings; there will always be some job loss. The best Government policies, the best business practices cannot stop these changes. But what we can do is to help our people shape the change. Government has to equip people with life-long learning, reemployment, health care security. Businesses have to keep pushing for productivity improvements. Leaders in the private sector have to strive for new ways to help their own workers benefit from productivity increases throughout well-conceived strategic planning and new innovations and creating high-performance workplaces and letting workers participate in more decision-making.

We talked this morning at breakfast about how Japan still has basically a lifetime employment policy. In order to do that, you have to be willing to carry your workers through the tough times and always have the companies find new things to do, because that way, you don't have to go to a new company. However we do it, there is a big responsibility here that can only be borne by the private sector not by Government. From companies that make cars to those that write software, some of the greatest gains have been achieved by those who treated their workers as their most important asset, who gave their workers the most respect and the largest role in figuring out how to do what has to be done to compete and win in the global economy. These are the high performance workplaces that train and retrain their employees, empower them to take personal responsibility for the quality of the products and services, and treat the workers and the unions as friends, not adversaries.

Today, I am going to visit a company called Detroit Diesel that's working with the UAW to make high-quality engines for domestic

and foreign markets. The chief executive, Robert Penske, is known to most of you for sending championship teams to the Indianapolis 500 Race. And he's also, however, building a championship team here at Detroit Diesel, a team succeeding in the face of change.

The third challenge we have is to offer people security in their own lives while maintaining the dynamism of market economies. This is a big deal, and it's a difficult one. How can we give workers the security they need? What kind of unemployment system must we have, what kind of health care must we have, what kind of training system must we have, what kind of policies must we have for family leave and for child care or for caring for parents that enable people to succeed as workers and as family members?

We have seen in the United States, more than in any other country present here, the awful price we pay if the family disintegrates as an institution. It is a more fundamental institution than the workplace. It is the most fundamental institution.

But we know that most of our people are now in the work force. Most mothers with children over one year of age are now in the work force. How can we make it possible for people to do what they have to do as workers and do what they have to do as family members? How does the Government intervene in that in a way that makes work forces more productive instead of putting so many burdens on the work unit that they can't compete in the global economy. This is a tough, difficult, even painful thing for most of us to discuss, but we have to be honest about it. And I look forward to the next day and a half to seeing some very stimulating discussions about this.

In every country we have a find the right formula. We can't just fall into dogmatism or ideology and pretend that one or the other doesn't matter. But we know that when secure workers with secure families, knowing they are succeeding as parents, show up for work, they are free to be the most productive workers in the world. We also know that there is a limit for the cost any operation can bear and still be productive. So we are going to have to talk through and work through these difficult issues.

I know the United States has benefited from the resilience of its firms and its workers and the flexibility of its labor markets. I also know we have been hurt by the gnawing insecurity of millions of our people when they lose their health care or they can't change jobs because they've got somebody in their family that's been sick with a pre-existing condition.

I know that the family leave law, in my own mind, that we signed here last year, which simply brought us into line with every other country that's here at the G-7, and 170 others around the world, is going to make the American workplace stronger because people won't have to lose their jobs when they take care of sick children or parents in need. These are things that we have to face.

So as we seek to find these proper balances, to help people deal with these three challenges, let us recognize two simple truths: First, the market with all of its unruly energy and all of its dislocation, is still an unstoppable, unstoppable and absolutely indispensable force for progress. We have to have markets where people are making choices. Second, our societies can promote human values from the strength of our families to the skills of our workers. We can do that, and in so doing, empower people to take full advantage of the opportunities provided by a vibrant market economy.

Now, I believe if you believe these things, then you say, "Well, why are we all here? Why must we act together? Why must we act together in our own countries? Why should these nations that share so much try to act together among themselves?" I want the ministers to explore these questions honestly and openly. But it is perfectly clear, again I will say, that it is easier for us to do what we need to do at home if we know people in other countries are working with us and that we're all going to win over the long run.

So let us ask the hard questions. First, what really is the jobs problem? Why is unemployment too high even when growth occurs? Can we really talk about one national unemployment rate anymore? Does the national unemployment rate mean anything to any of you here in Michigan? No, you want to know what the unemployment rate is in

Michigan or what it is in Detroit or what it is in Wayne County, right? Is there a national unemployment rate that is meaningful? Are there trends in all these countries that make the overall rate of unemployment in each less important than the rates among different sectors of the society, especially among people who, because of their long-term unemployment, their lack of skills, or their isolation from investment opportunities, have absolutely lost touch with the labor markets?

Second, what's the best strategy for worldwide cooperation on monetary and fiscal policy to stimulate growth and create jobs? How do we balance our fears of inflation with the need for economic growth?

Third, how can we build a social safety net that helps our people advance and helps our economies grow? Can we provide lifelong learning, help people to balance the demands of work and family, give people health security, and still keep our economies dynamic? And if so, what is the best way to do that?

Fourth, history has shown productivity brings better jobs and higher wages. But how do we, when change is so rapid, make the case to our people that this will be true in this time as it has always been true in the past? And with the rapid technological change of the information age, how can Government policies and business practices show workers that change and productivity can be harnessed for their advantage?

None of us can find the answers to all of these questions just within the borders of our individual countries. At this conference, as we share our insights, our views, and our practical experiences, every one of our nations will benefit. If we find new and effective ways to generate jobs and increase incomes, the working people of all nations will be the winners. It is my hope that this conference will continue the work that we began last year where these great industrial nations work together to get things done.

For years, the G-7 nations consulted with each other about the great issues of macroeconomics and global finance. Today, we are beginning a serious conversation about the economic well-being of ordinary people in each of these countries. This is an historic, important, and long-overdue moment.

We all must succeed. If any of us fails to convince our people to embrace change, then that nation might well retreat from the global economy. That could set off a downward spiral of protectionism and lower growth and turning backward which could affect us all.

If the faces of the new economy, these fine people I introduced here today can have the courage to change, then so can we, each of us as nations. We can proceed in the spirit that President Roosevelt called bold, persistent experimentation. If we can move forward from this conference filled with the faith that we can make change work for the ordinary citizens in these countries, for all of our people, then we will succeed. And we will go from this conference to the meeting of all of the leaders of the G-7 countries in Naples with a real agenda where we can all be committed to going forward here.

Let me say that, in closing, we've faced a lot of difficult and decisive choices like this before. We haven't always made the right decision. At the end of World War I our nations turned inward, and it led us to depression and another world war. After World War II, our nations turned outward. They faced the future courageously. Old enemies embraced each other in a common cause of human development. Alliances were built; institutions were created that kept the peace, promoted prosperity, advanced democracy, and won the cold war.

Now we have to choose once again. And this conference is a part of that choosing. Will we have the courage to embrace change and build our people up? I think I know the answer. Together we have to find it.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:45 a.m. in Fox Theater. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Dennis Archer of Detroit.

Remarks at Detroit Diesel in Detroit March 14, 1994

Thank you very much. Thank you very much for that wonderful welcome and for the tour and the opportunity I had to shake hands with so many of you. When you were asked how many of you had roots in my home State, I met seven or eight people just walk-

ing through the line, and I read in the morning paper that the University of Arkansas now has to be in the same NCAA championship bracket as Michigan. So some of you are going to have divided loyalties. [Laughter] I'm just scared about it. I don't know.

I want to thank my good friend Congressman John Conyers for being here and for his eloquent remarks. And I want to thank Senator Don Riegle for what he said and for all the years of service he gave to Michigan and to the United States. He didn't speak like he was retiring from the Senate today, but he says he is, and I thank you, sir, for your service. Two other Members of your congressional delegation came with me, and they're over here somewhere, Senator Carl Levin and Congressman John Dingell, who is going to help me pass a good health care plan for all the American people. Thank you both for being here. Thank you, Owen Bieber, for being here and for being my friend and comrade. And I want to thank Lud for this wonderful tour of this plant and also Jim Brown; your local UAW leader is not up here with us, but he met me. He challenged me to go running with him next time I came. It was all I could do to run with the mayor today. I don't know if I can handle him. [Laughter] And I want to say a special word of thanks to Roger Penske for saving all of your jobs and giving you something good to do.

You know, I'm in Detroit today because we are having a day-and-a-half meeting of the finance and economic ministers of the so-called "G-7 nations." They're the big industrial nations of the world that have been meeting together for many years now, Japan and Germany and France and Great Britain and Canada and Italy and us. I think that's seven. I didn't keep count when I was going through. And all of these countries, interestingly enough, are having real problems either creating jobs or raising the incomes of their working people, even when their economies are growing. Everyone except the western part of Germany has a higher unemployment rate than the United States, and yet, we know in this country, for about 20 years, the average wages of working people have been almost stagnant, barely keeping up with inflation, if at all. So this is a worldwide problem.

We know part of it has to do with global competition, part of it has to do with not changing with the pace of technology.

There are a lot of things that we know. I wanted to come here today to illustrate that while nobody can fully describe the problem, we do know how to solve it with people like you and plants like this. You know, I'm a racing fan, so I knew all about Roger Penske. I've actually been to Indianapolis and seen the 500. But I think the race he's winning here with you and your lives and your children is far more important than any Indianapolis race he will ever win, because our country is riding on it.

We know it works if labor and management work together. We know it works if there is good technology. We know it works if there's a commitment to sell abroad as well as at home. We know it works if everybody has a passionate, abiding commitment to quality. I like the fact that you no longer have a check for quality at the end of the line, but everybody has to do it all along the way, so that everybody has responsibility for the final product. We know that stuff works. And when you strip it all away, I want you to just think about it: What works in this plant would work not only in every other workplace in America but would go a long way toward solving our other problems.

I always tell people that I got into this work, and I certainly ran for President fully aware of all the hazards and pitfalls, because I had the old-fashioned view that the purpose of public service was to bring people together and to get things done and really, to exalt the dignity and potential of every individual. And if you think about it, the reason this deal is working for you is everybody is important, everybody counts, and people work together. And if we could, in everything we do, think about what we could do to exalt the dignity and the potential in every person, we'd be a long way ahead. All these little children growing up in troubled family situations, in neighborhood situations, in difficult and even dangerous schools, nobody's thinking about their dignity or their potential.

Every day, so many things happen in this country from so many forces of power designed to strip people of their dignity, to undermine their potential, to weaken their abil-

ity to become what God meant them to be. And I just wanted to come here because what you have done is terribly important not only for you and your families but as an example of what we ought to do economically and socially as a country as we look toward the 21st century.

I am convinced that in spite of all of the tough times we've been through as a people over the last 20 years, I am convinced that we can go into the next century as the greatest country in the world with our children looking forward to the most exciting future and the most peaceful future any people have ever known if we remember that we're going up or down together, so we might as well get together, and if we remember that we have to build on one another's strengths and we have to build each other up, not tear each other down, and if we remember we can fight over dividing the pie all we want, but unless we're growing the pie, unless we're making a better life for everybody and producing something that is good, we are not going to succeed.

Those basic lessons that have led you to double your sales, that have given you markets around the world, and that got the kind of cheer that you gave Roger Penske today are lessons that America ought to learn, that every other advanced country in the world ought to learn, and that I am trying as hard as I can to make sure, guide every decision I make as your President and every decision our administration makes. So you just remember that. What you're doing here is what America ought to be doing: getting people together, getting things done, building human dignity. If we can do that, there is nothing we cannot achieve.

Thank you. God bless you all. I love being here.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:26 p.m. In his remarks, he referred to Owen Bieber, president, and Jim Brown, plant chairman, United Auto Workers; Ludwick Koci, president, Detroit Diesel Company; and Roger Penske, chief executive officer, Detroit Diesel, and owner and manager of the Penske racing team.

Exchange With Reporters in Boston, Massachusetts

March 14, 1994

Resignation of Webster L. Hubbell

The President. I haven't talked to him yet, and I haven't talked to him since this whole issue came up, but now I will call him as soon as I possibly can. I do think, based on what I understand the facts to be, it's the right thing. He strongly feels that he will be vindicated, but it's going to take some time for him to do it and that he shouldn't be working at a public job while he's doing that. And I think that's right.

Q. Do you think he did something wrong, Mr. President?

The President. I have no—I do not know—I have no knowledge of the facts. Based on my knowledge of him, I find that hard to believe. I mean, the most—I think if you talk to the hundreds and hundreds of people who feel they know him, they'd all have a hard time believing that. He's one of the most widely esteemed people that I've ever known. He had very few detractors. So I think that we just have to take him at his word, give him a chance to go home and deal with this, and see what happens. I think he did the right thing.

He also, I want to say, has been an enormous contributor at the Justice Department, really had an enormously positive impact there from the early days of my administration. I am very grateful to him. And he is a good personal friend of mine, as all of you know. I just—I wish him well. I hope that it works out. But I think he made the right decision because he wants to go home and really defend himself and work through this thing. And we'll just see what happens.

Q. Do you feel, Mr. President, that this is another perceived setback for your administration? It seems like you've come under a lot of deep fire lately.

The President. Well, this is something—as I've said, I have no knowledge of this. We'll just have to see what happens. But I'm not worried about that. We'll proceed with the Justice Department, and we'll go right on. This is, for me, more of a personal deal for Webb Hubbell and for his many, many

friends at home and around the country. I'm hoping that it works out for him, and I think he made the right decision.

Q. Has it adversely affected operations at the Justice Department?

The President. Oh, no, not at all. Not a bit. And I feel that it won't. I can assure you nobody will let that happen.

Q. Will you invite him back?

The President. Well, as I said in my letter to him—he said he'd hoped he could return to public service, and I said in my letter that I hope he would be able to.

It is, frankly, kind of typical of him. His first concern was that nothing be done that would in any way cause any harm to the Justice Department or any difficulty for anybody else. So he just wants to get out, go home, clean this up, and he said he hoped that he would be able to come back. And I hope that it will work out so that he can, too.

Q. Do you think he was honest with you, sir?

The President. Thank you. I have no reason to believe he wasn't.

NOTE: The exchange began at 4:45 p.m. at Logan International Airport. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks at Rowes Wharf in Boston March 14, 1994

Thank you so much. Thank you for this wonderful, warm welcome to this magnificent old city that is forever young. I am so happy to be back here. I'm thrilled by this enormous crowd, honored by your enthusiasm and support, your concern, and your commitment for your country. I thank all those who are here with me, your State attorney general; your State auditor; the State chair of our Democratic Party; your wonderful new mayor, Mayor Menino, it's nice to see you; Congressman Moakley, who said that you can tell how much I love Massachusetts by how many times I come to his congressional district—that's a good political remark if I ever heard it—[*Laughter*]—Congressman Markey, Congressman Meehan who are here. I want to say a special word of thanks to your two United States Senators, first, to John Kerry for his steadfast leader-

ship to try to help us pass a crime bill in the United States Congress that is both tough and smart, that gives our young people something to say yes to while we're being tougher on crime, that takes assault weapons off the street and puts policemen on the beat and gives our kids a better future. I thank him for that, and so should you. I also thank him for the work that he has done in putting the credibility he justly earned as a valiant veteran in the war in Vietnam on the line to help us reconcile with Vietnam and move forward to a new chapter in our relationship with that country, and get a full and fair accounting of all of our MIA's and POW's. And I want to thank Senator Ted Kennedy not only for his warm personal support but for being the lion, the champion, the stalwart of the elemental principle that health care is a fundamental right and every American ought to have it. He's been fighting for that for almost two decades now, and he has the President by his side. And we're going to get it done this year.

My fellow Americans, I have just come from Detroit, a city which was racked during the 1980's with massive job losses in the automobile industry, a city which is rebuilding itself, even as our car industry comes back with increasing productivity and quality, taking back market share all across our country and in other countries. We have there going on now a conference of the world's great industrial nations, where the finance ministers and the commerce ministers and others have come together to discuss this vexing question: Why is it that all the wealthy countries in the world are having trouble either creating new jobs or rewarding their workers with higher incomes? This is not just an American issue.

But I can tell you I was proud to go there today and say to them, "You said to us for years we should bring down our budget deficit; well, we have. The other guys talked about it, and we did it. And if the Congress passes our budget this year, for the first time since Harry Truman was President, the deficit will go down for 3 years in a row." And what has happened, low inflation, low interest rates, high investment, over 2 million new jobs in the first 13 months of this administration, 90 percent of them not in Government

but in the private sector. I know there is more to do, but we are making a beginning.

I also want to say that we are doing what we can to give our young people access to the education and training they need. With the leadership of Senator Kennedy and others last year, we completely rewrote the student loan law, a very important issue in this bastion of higher education, so that when this law becomes fully effective, our young people will be able to borrow money to go to college, whether they are middle class or poor, at lower interest rates and pay it back on easier terms not based on how much they borrowed or loaned but also based on how much they make when they go to school, so they will never be discouraged from borrowing the money to go to college and get the education they need.

Finally, last year we did something that I was inspired to do by all these wonderful young people from City Year, we passed a national service program. This year there will be 20,000 more like them all across the country and year after next, 100,000 more earning credit against college, solving the problems of this country, building up America instead of tearing it down.

And now, and let me say, the most important sign I saw of all the wonderful signs you held up today was the sign the young people from City Year had on that boat. They said, "Thank you for believing in the youth of America." I do, and I think you do, too.

My fellow Americans, this year we have much work to do. In the Congress, we are working on totally revamping the unemployment system of our country so people can begin to get new training from the moment they lose their jobs. We are working on reforming the welfare system so that more people can move from dependence to independence, can be successful parents and successful workers. We are working on a dramatic change in our criminal justice initiatives, as Senator Kerry said, to put another 100,000 police officers on the street, take assault weapons off the street, stiffen our ability to get guns out of the hands of people who should not have them—the Brady bill is already beginning to work in that regard—and provide alternatives for first-time youthful offenders so they will have a better future.

Those are the kinds of things that we are doing.

And finally, as Senator Kennedy said, we are going to do our dead-level best this year, and I believe we are going to make it, to finally, finally, finally join the ranks of every other advanced nation in the world and give our American families health care security that is always there, that can never be taken away from them.

I know there will always be problems that we have to address, with all the changes that are coming on into our economy. On the way over here, I spoke with your congressional delegation about the difficulties that the fishermen in Massachusetts and New England are facing. Let me tell you something: We are going to make sure that you do not become an endangered species. You have earned the right to go forward, and we will work on that. We have defense workers from Connecticut to California who are threatened, and we are working on that. But what I want to tell you is, we are going in the right direction, and we can keep going in the right direction if we remember to keep our eyes on those things which really matter and if we do not become diverted.

Just before I got on the plane to come here, I visited a fascinating plant in Detroit, owned by a man named Roger Penske. You may know him because his teams have won eight Indianapolis 500 races. But let me tell you what he did. This plant was about to be closed several years ago. He went in and bailed it out, made an agreement with the union that they would solve all their problems together. Grievances on the plant floor dropped to virtually zero. A new spirit of partnership took over. They began to sell their diesel engines all around the world. They began to increase production and sales. They hired more people. And today, this plant that was on the verge of being closed, with 3,000 people losing their jobs, have doubled their sales, added employment. They have the best labor-management cooperation anyone can imagine.

Do you know how they did it? They did it because fundamentally, they were interested in building up one another. They recognized the dignity of every man and woman in that plant. They understood that people

wanted to be able to be successful as workers and as parents, building their families and their future. And by doing that and focusing on that, everything else worked out all right. I tell you today, my friends, if we can go back to Washington and wipe away all of the forces that seek to demean, to divide, to downgrade, and just focus on the spirit and the hope and the dignity that we see in the faces of these young people here, we could solve the problems of this country and do it in short order. That is what we ought to be about.

And I pledge to you that I will honor the support the people of Massachusetts gave me in 1992. I will honor the signs that greeted me here today. I will never forget the spirit, the drive, the imagination, and the talent that the people of this State have. And when I go back to Washington, I will be there working with your friends here to make sure that we restore the kind of spirit and dignity and possibility to our National Government that will make it possible for us to keep this economy on the move, to pass health care and a crime bill and welfare reform and redo the unemployment system, and do all those things that in the end will just allow all of us to live up to the fullest of our God-given potential as one united nation, moving into the 21st century, with the kind of pride and success that you deserve.

Thank you very much, and God bless you all. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:42 p.m. at Rowes Wharf, a commercial and residential development. In his remarks, he referred to State Attorney General L. Scott Harshbarger; State Auditor A. Joseph DeNucci; and Chair of the Democratic Party for New Hampshire Chris Spirou.

Remarks at the New England Presidential Dinner in Boston *March 14, 1994*

Thank you. Thank you, Mayor, for your strong and supportive words and your good leadership and for the wonderful, wonderful entry into Boston today. When you had the boat out there spewing water and all those thousands of people and all those young people from City Year out there cheering, I

began to feel like a real President. [*Laughter*] I thank you, Lea Salonga, for traveling thousands of miles to sing for me tonight. And I'm glad I got to shake your hand. You're a great talent, and we were graced by your music. Thank you so much. I want to thank Alan and Fred and Elaine and my good friend Paul Montrone, in his absence, and all the rest of you who made this dinner possible tonight. I want to thank David Wilhelm for the hard work that he's given to the Democratic committee and for that fine film that makes my speech irrelevant. [*Laughter*] It was wonderful, wasn't it? It was a good movie. It reminded us of—[*applause*]. I thank Senator Kerry for his remarks and for his leadership, for his defense of the spirit and the objectives of this administration on the floor of the Senate and his leadership in so many areas but especially now in trying to enact a crime bill that is both tough and intelligent and his belief that we could enact a major piece of anticrime legislation that would really begin to attack some of the root causes of crime and to adopt some things that actually work to reduce the crime rate instead of just to raise the decibel level of the rhetoric that is in the air. John Kerry was the first Member of the Congress who convinced me we might actually be able to persuade people of both parties to approve a bill in the range of \$22 billion and that we might actually be able to put 100,000 more police officers on the street and take these assault weapons off the street and give our young people some things to say yes to and have adequate drug treatment and do some things that really make sense. The whole country is in his debt, as am I and are you. I want to thank, too, as strongly as I can say your senior Senator, Ted Kennedy. I'm glad that he seems to be well on his way to a strong reelection.

You know, long before I had ever really thought about the obligations of this country in the area of health care, and I was the youngest elected Governor in America but not yet in office in 1978, the Democratic Party had a mid-year convention in Memphis. And I received a call from the White House when President Carter was in office, asking me if I would moderate a discussion of this issue, featuring Joe Califano, the then

Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare and Senator Kennedy, neither of them being shrinking violets. [Laughter] I was 32 years old at the time and mortified. So of course I said I would do it. And people were there from all over the country. I only had to cross the Mississippi River from home to be there. But I remember—it's been 16 years ago now—as vividly as if it happened yesterday, when Ted Kennedy stood on that stage and said for the first time, I think, to a truly national audience that the health care that had been given his son when he was desperately ill should be available to every American. He said it then, and we're going to make it happen now.

The film was about what we did last year, only a little about what we're trying to do this year. I can say that in a couple of minutes and then make the one central point I wish to make to all of you tonight. Last year we had a very good year. This year we have to keep working on the economy. If we can keep the growth going, we'll have a very good year, indeed. We've had 2.1 million new jobs in 13 months, 90 percent of them in the private sector. Most job growth was in State and local government in some years of the 1980's, or at least a huge percentage of it was. And we want to keep that going. We want to pass health care, health security that is always there in a way that keeps what is best about health care, which you can appreciate in this shining tribute to the American health care triumph, and fix what is wrong. We want to pass a comprehensive welfare reform bill that will liberate people from the dependence of a system that has aggravated some of the worst pressures in the breakdown of the family in this country. We want to pass this crime bill. We want to pass, as John Kerry said, a campaign finance reform bill, a lobby reform bill. We want to pass a comprehensive overhaul in the unemployment system, which is designed for a time which no longer exists. It used to be when people went on unemployment they needed a little money to get by on until the economy picked up again and they were called back to their old jobs. Now the huge majority of people who are unemployed don't get called back to their old jobs, they have to find new ones. It's wrong to tax employers to pay for an income system

that's inadequate, that is leading nowhere. We need to change the whole system and begin immediately to prepare people when they lose their jobs for another—a different job, one in which they can succeed and win in the global economy. These are all things we need to do. And we mean to do them this year, in spite of the fact, or maybe because of the fact that it is an election year.

Now, this is a Democratic Party dinner, and it occurred to me that those of you who are here have supported this administration and me personally and the fine people who are associated with our efforts in spite of the fact that on April the 15th almost all of you will get a higher tax bill—[laughter]—because you know all the money is going to reduce the deficit, and you know it's meant lower interest rates, record-high markets, new investment, and a growing economy.

As has already been said, our trading partners around the world beat on us for a decade to get the deficit down. If my new budget passes the Congress, and it's well on its way already, we'll have 3 years of deficit reduction for the first time since Harry Truman was President, and we will have laid the foundation for a strong private recovery.

These things are terribly important. But that's not the point I want to make tonight. The point I want to make tonight is that there have always been differences between Democrats and Republicans. And these differences have taken different forms at different times. On occasion, the Republican Party has been the party of true and progressive change. The best example was, of course, the first and greatest Republican President, Abraham Lincoln. Another example was Teddy Roosevelt, who helped to usher in the modern era of new Presidents, of activist Presidents, a man who wanted to save much of our natural resources, a man without whom there would be no buffalo in America today, just for example, and many of our national parks would not be there, a man who understood the dangers of great concentrations of power, whether in Government or in the private sector—people like President Eisenhower, who really tried to build a bipartisan foreign policy to help to move us away from the military industrial complex, but leave us strong enough to win the cold war.

Even Richard Nixon, though he's been much maligned, signed the bill to create the Environmental Protection Agency and first proposed that all employers should contribute to their employees' health insurance so that everyone could be covered.

I say that to point out that there have been good and bad ideas embraced, I guess, by both parties at different times. I'm a Democrat by heritage, instinct, and conviction because I believe most of the time in American history we've been on the side of ordinary people, on the side of bringing people together, and on the side of the future. We have been the party of change in a constructive and profound way. I thought when I ran for President I would have the chance to enter one of these great debates and we would see what would happen, whether I was right and wrong or my ideas were right and wrong.

Almost from the beginning I saw a very different edge to the Republican Party in this time, not the party of Lincoln and Roosevelt or Eisenhower but the party dedicated just to being against whatever we were for and committed to the politics of personal destruction. They were so busy with it they even tried to look in my passport file in the campaign in '92, something that didn't bother me. I was happy to have them rummaging around in my passport file instead of coming up with a good idea that might sound better than one of my ideas. Let them go. Now, as you pointed out, they are at it again. They have a little health retreat, and they can't agree on a health care plan, so they come back and get at it again.

I just want you to know something. You look at the people that are in our administration; they get up every day and try to make something good happen for America. Senator Kennedy mentioned my wife, well-known to many of you here because she went to Wellesley and spent a lot of time in Massachusetts, has just committed herself in a passionate way to trying to figure out how to solve this health problem to give ordinary people the chance to get health care. Let them come and debate her. Do they want to do that? No, they would rather take out after her. It saves them the trouble of having

to come up with an alternative health care plan.

The Vice President of the United States, I think the ablest and most influential person ever to hold that office, and someone who has been a credit to this country, who cares passionately about what he is doing, Eli Segal, we passed a national service bill; it will stand as the symbol of what this administration tried to do. Did you see those kids holding that sign when we came in the harbor today? "Thank you for believing in the youth of America." This is a big deal. This is a very important time in our history—sweeping changes going through our economy and society, terrible problems that beg for honest debate from people of different perspectives.

Even if we get the economy going, even if we provide health care to all, even if we revise the unemployment system, if we do all the things I said, how can we survive as a country if within a few years over half of our kids are born into families where there was never a marriage? How will we transmit the kinds of coherent values to our people? How can we expect the young people, if they are born into fairly chaotic circumstances where they're not isolated so someone can come in and help them, to behave 15 years from now?

These are profound problems. They beg for debate. We need to think about new and different things in totally different ways than we have in the past. No one, even our party—let's be honest about it—we don't have all the answers. We need an honest debate about the future of family in America, about how we're going to rebuild our communities in America. People say they're concerned about crime and violence; they ought to be. But you tell me how you can avoid it if you have people living in square block after square block after square block where the family, the community, and the work base is broken down and where vacuums are created into which drugs and crimes, gangs and weapons move?

We need a serious debate about that. We need a serious debate about the fact that wage earning—hourly wage earners have been working in this country for 20 years now with virtually no increase in their income and that every country—I just came from De-

troit, from our G-7 jobs summit—every wealthy country in the world is now having trouble creating new jobs even when their economy is growing.

We have always known in the past that productivity was good for jobs and incomes. I came from a part of the country where everybody used to work on the farm. You can't go back more than one generation older than me without finding somebody in your family that was on the farm. The farm jobs went away; people went to Detroit and Chicago and got jobs in the plants. Those economic changes have always happened. And every time technology and productivity took away jobs in one sector, more were created in another sector. Now we find that these wealthy countries are really having trouble with the explosion of technology, the explosion of productivity, and the globalization of the economy creating new jobs. Is something new happening in world history? I don't think so; I just think there are different lags. But the point is no one knows for sure. This begs for honest political debate and genuine conflicts of ideas.

Why then are we confronted in this administration with an opposition party that just stands up and says, "No, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, no"? When I was a Democratic Governor and they had the White House, I constantly sought them out, engaged them in debate, offered to work with them on issues from education to welfare reform to crime to you name it. I never did them the way they are doing us in Washington, DC, today. It is wrong, and it is not good for the United States of America.

I'll tell you something else. The mayor talked about me being a marathon runner. The marathon comes from a certain place inside me. I am an old-fashioned, really old-fashioned American. I believe more than half the time, in the contest between good and bad, good wins. In the contest between truth and falsehood, the truth wins out. I believe that most people want something that will elevate them and bring them together with different people, instead of something that will demean them and divide them from others. That's what I believe.

I believe fundamentally in the common sense and the essential core goodness of the

American people. Don't forget that Alexis de Tocqueville said a long time ago that America is great because America is good, and if America ever ceases to be good, she will no longer be great. We have to appeal to what is good in this country. And we have to ask people to face hard truths and debate hard issues and come together and think new thoughts about problems that we are, frankly, not solving today. That is what I wanted to do when I became President and what I am doing my best to do. And I am only sorry that too often, in too many ways, on too many days, it is a debate which engages only members of my party.

I will say this: Senator Kennedy has had some good success in getting a substantial number of Republican Senators to talk seriously about health care. We are having some help in dealing with the issues of crime. But this overriding negative, intensely personal, totally political, devoid of principle attack is not good for the country, and it is inconsistent with the tradition of Abraham Lincoln and Teddy Roosevelt.

If I ask you to go home tonight and make a list of the greatest Presidents who ever served here and the greatest things that were ever done in Washington for the American people, you would have members of both parties on your list. But every one of them would have done something good for the American people, would have tried to elevate the dignity and the human potential of the men and women of this country, tried to give the children of this country a better future than their parents had.

I got into this work because that's what I wanted to do. And I am old-fashioned enough to believe that in every age and time the central purpose of our common political life will be to find new and important ways to get people together and to get things done so that we can elevate the meaning and content and direction of people's lives and do right by our children and by our future. That is what I think. And I'll tell you something. In 1994, in 1996, if there is only one party that believes that, the American people in droves will come to us.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:08 p.m. at the Boston Park Plaza. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Thomas Menino of Boston; entertainer Lea Salonga; Alan Leventhal, Fred Seigel, Elaine Shuster, and Paul Montrone, dinner organizers; David Wilhelm, Democratic National Committee chairman; and Eli J. Segal, chief executive officer, Corporation for National and Community Service.

**Statement on the Nomination of
Admiral Jeremy M. Boorda To Be
Chief of Naval Operations**

March 14, 1994

I am pleased to announce that I have nominated Admiral Jeremy M. Boorda to succeed Admiral Frank A. Kelso II as Chief of Naval Operations.

Admiral Boorda is currently serving as Commander in Chief, U.S. Naval Forces, Europe/Commander in Chief, Allied Forces, Southern Europe where he is responsible for coordinating and planning NATO military actions over Bosnia-Herzegovina and in the Mediterranean and Adriatic Seas.

Admiral Boorda brings to the job of Chief of Naval Operations a keen appreciation of operational requirements in the post-cold-war world and an outstanding ability to work with our allies in complex and challenging circumstances. He has distinguished himself as one of the foremost military leaders serving in the armed services today, and his counsel and guidance on the many national security issues facing our Nation will be of great value.

Admiral Boorda assumes the post of Chief of Naval Operations at an important time in the history of the United States Navy. I will depend on him to continue the progress that Admiral Kelso has made in restructuring the Navy to meet the new domestic and international security environments.

I have also nominated Vice Admiral Leighton W. Smith, Jr., U.S. Navy, to relieve Admiral Boorda and be promoted to the rank of admiral. As the former Director for Operations, U.S. European Command, and the current Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Plans, Policy and Operations, Vice Admiral Smith possesses a thorough understanding of NATO structure and the requirements of the European theater of operations.

**Letter Accepting the Resignation of
Webster L. Hubbell as Associate
Attorney General**

March 14, 1994

Dear Webb:

It is with profound sadness and regret that I accept your resignation as Associate Attorney General.

I know better than anyone the spirit of citizenship and devotion to the law that inspired you to join our Administration and to take part, as Holmes said, in the actions and passions of our time. In the last year, these values came shining through as you worked for civil justice reform and immigration enforcement, fought to end discrimination in public housing, and to protect the civil and voting rights of all Americans.

In these tasks you affirmed our commitment to justice, always with keen judgment and good humor, especially at vital times of challenge for the Department. The Attorney General and I will miss the service and advice you gave us. And I know your accomplishments in office will outlast any interest in the private matters that have arisen from your prior law practice and that motivated the difficult decision you announced today.

Like you, I hope that you will return one day to public service. I remain, as always, grateful for your long and lasting friendship.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

Dear Mr. President:

For over a year, I have had the privilege of serving you, the Attorney General, and the nation at the Department of Justice. I am deeply grateful and honored for this opportunity to serve as the Associate Attorney General of the United States. I have tried to serve with honor and distinction and to follow your lead in trying to make a difference in the every day lives of the American people.

As a public servant, I owe it to you and to the American people to evaluate constantly whether my continued service can be as effective as you would expect of me, whether it furthers or distracts from your agenda, and what effect being in the public eye is having on my family and colleagues.

Over the past weekend I have undertaken such an evaluation, and I have decided to submit my resignation as Associate Attorney General. My resignation shall be effective as soon as possible, allowing the Attorney General the time to effect a smooth transition at the Justice Department.

I am proud of the reputation I have established over the past 20 years as a private lawyer, Arkansas Supreme Court Justice, public official, and private citizen. Unfortunately, because of public speculation about me and my former law firm, I will have to spend a significant amount of my personal time on an internal matter with my former partners. I am confident of the outcome.

I will leave the Department of Justice with great admiration for the Attorney General, high regard for the professionalism and dedication of its employees, and with great pride in the Department's accomplishments during the past year.

Public service has always been one of the greatest joys of my professional life. It is my sincere hope and belief that by devoting sufficient time and energy now to my family and other private issues, I will reenter public service in the future. Thank you for allowing me such a wonderful opportunity and, most of all, thank you for your friendship.

Respectfully,

Webster L. Hubbell

NOTE: Originals were not available for verification of the content of these letters.

Remarks at a Town Meeting in Nashua, New Hampshire

March 15, 1994

The President. Thank you so much. I want to thank the principal of this school for calling the assembly to order, Mayor Wagner, for welcoming me here, and Senator Barbara Baldizar, of whom I am so proud, who served with such distinction in our campaign in 1992 and Congressman Dick Swett for that fine introduction and for the work he does in your behalf in Washington. There are many others here today, legislators, other officials, school officials, and personal friends. I'm glad to see all of you here.

I announced my candidacy for President in New Hampshire here in Nashua in October of 1991. I told you I'd keep coming back. I know I'm a week late for your traditional town meeting, but I'm not 4 years late. I did show up.

I have so many vivid memories of this community. I remember I was so nervous the first day I came here in October of '91. I said, "Nobody knows who I am, nobody knows where I'm from, nobody knows anything." And we were on our way to a restaurant where some people had probably been dragged kicking and screaming to come and meet me for the first time. And on the way, there was one other cafe, and I just decided I would go in and shake hands there and start, just cold. And so my wife and I walked in, and there was one guy sitting at the counter drinking a cup of coffee. And he turned around and he said, "I know who you are. I'm a construction worker from Leachville, Arkansas, and you're the best Governor we ever had." So I said to myself, these people are so shrewd up here, they will never believe I did not place this man on this stool—[laughter]—and that I never saw him before or since.

I remember going to the Moe Arel Center and talking to the people who live there about their health care concerns. I remember in the hotel where I stayed last night, an early morning meeting I had with Senator Jay Rockefeller from West Virginia, before we had a big health care forum where people came from all over New Hampshire and all over New England. I remember so many things that I have done in this community, and I'm very grateful to be back.

I've just come from Detroit, where I was meeting with finance and other economic officials from the G-7 nations, the world's largest industrial nations, Canada and France, Great Britain and Germany, Italy, Japan and the United States, talking about the problems that every wealthy nation in the world is now having, even in times of economic growth, in creating new jobs and raising incomes, talking about how we are in an entirely different global economy that is changing very rapidly, opening up new opportunities but also imposing new obstacles to the fulfillment of human potential everywhere, and what we

can do together to deal with the problems we face.

I learned a lot about those problems right here in New Hampshire. I think it is no secret to anybody who knows me the depth of affection and commitment I developed to the people of this State, even those who didn't vote for me, because of the experiences I had here in 1991 and 1992, because of the laboratory you provided for all of us who sought the Presidency to learn about the continuing problems and the enduring promise of this great country.

Ever since I started this campaign here, and in every day I have been President, I have been focused on what it will take for us to do what we need to do to move into the 21st century as the greatest country on Earth, giving our children a better future and getting our people to live up to their potential. I always believed that the purpose of public life was to get people together and to get things done and to lift human dignity and human potential.

When I first took office, my first line of business was to get our economic house in order. We had seen in only 12 years a quadrupling of our national debt. We had seen America with such a huge deficit that all of our trading partners, every year for 10 years got together in these great G-7 summits and passed delicate resolutions pointing their finger at the United States saying, "If you don't bring your Government deficit down, you're going to wreck the world economy."

And so we went to work on that. Last year, Congress passed an economic plan that will reduce the deficit by \$500 billion. If they pass the budget I presented this year, which passed the House in record time, we will have 3 years of reduction in the Federal Government's deficit in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was the President of the United States.

Now, that has led to lower interest rates, low inflation, increased investments, increased activity in any number of sectors of the economy, and a real economic comeback for the country in 13 months—2.1 million new jobs, 90 percent of them in the private sector. In the 1980's, a far higher percentage of new jobs coming into our economy were in State and local government, not in the pri-

vate sector. So I believe we have made a good beginning. The unemployment rate in New Hampshire is about a point and a half lower than it was when I was elected President, and I'm proud of that.

The economic plan also, as people will find out on April 15th, contains some very important changes in our Nation's tax laws. Yes, income tax rates were raised for the top 1.2 percent of income earners, and all the money was dedicated to deficit reduction. But almost 17 percent of our taxpayers will get an income tax cut. Almost all of them will be working people with children on modest incomes. It is a very important thing to do to encourage people to work, to make it possible for them to be successful workers and successful parents, and to discourage people from going on to welfare. Here in New Hampshire, it will cover 41,000 taxpayers.

In addition to that, the small businesses will find—and this is terribly important to you—this new economic plan contains several incentives to try to help deal with some of the problems that I learned about here in New Hampshire. Most of your job loss has been in larger companies; most of your job gains have been in smaller companies. This new program makes 90 percent of the small businesses in America eligible for a tax cut on April 15th by increasing the expensing provision for small business by 70 percent and provides dramatic new incentives for people to invest in new and small businesses, with a long-term capital gains cut of 50 percent for people who invest in those businesses for 5 years or longer.

In addition to that, we are doing a lot to try to change the regulatory environment in which our financial institutions make loans. In the end, that is the ultimate test of our success. It was here in Nashua that I first heard horror story after horror story after horror story about people having their loans foreclosed when they had never missed a payment. I think it's fair to say that our success record there has been substantial, but uneven, and that practices are still different around the country. But we are moving deliberately to try to do that, so that we can free up capital to invest in America, to grow jobs in the private sector.

A lot of your firms here in New Hampshire and throughout New England are high-tech firms that depend upon markets abroad as well as at home. We've lifted export controls on \$37 billion worth of high-tech equipment and opened new markets through a generation's worth of trade agreements concluded last year, the North American Free Trade Agreement with Mexico, a new General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade throughout the world.

And for our young people, we've reformed—as I said I would in town meeting after town meeting after town meeting here in this State—we've reformed the college loan program so that now more loans will be available at lower interest rates and young people will be able to pay them back not just based on how much they borrow but as a percentage of their income after they go to work, so that it will always be manageable, the repayment of the loans, and no one will ever be discouraged from going to college. Last year, the Congress passed the national service program that I talked about in all the town meetings here. This year, 20,000 young Americans will be able to serve their communities, solving hard, concrete, human problems at the grassroots level and earn credit against their college education. Year after next, 100,000 young Americans will be able to do that, and I am proud of that.

The first law that I signed into being that was really the product of my campaign was the family and medical leave law, a law that had been twice vetoed before I became President. Just yesterday, in Detroit, I met a woman in a plant I visited, who came up to me with tears in her eyes and said, "I have already taken advantage of the family leave law. It matters; people should not have to lose their job to take care of their children or their parents."

So we are changing the country together as a result of the campaign which began in these dialogs in New Hampshire. This year, the Congress has a full schedule. First, we are trying to enact a new crime bill that is both tough and smart, building on the passage of the Brady bill last year, to put another 100,000 police officers on the streets not only in big cities but in small towns, to take assault weapons out of the hands of criminals, to try

to make sure that we punish serious offenders more severely but that we give first-time youthful offenders another chance and something to say yes to in life as well as something to say no to, and that we provide drug treatment on demand to deal with the fact that an enormous percentage of these crimes are the direct result of the drug problem.

We are trying to pass, in addition to the crime bill, a dramatic set of improvements in education laws, a school-to-work bill that will provide at least another year first and then 2 years of training for people who don't want to go to 4-year colleges but need further training, people like those whom I met with at the graduation at New Hampshire Technical College last May. This is a dramatic thing. The unemployment rate for people who have 2 years of post-high-school education in America today is 5.7 percent. The unemployment rate for high school graduates is about 7.5 percent. The unemployment rate for high school dropouts is over 11 percent. It makes a huge difference.

We are attempting to reform the entire unemployment system to change it to a re-employment system, to consolidate the programs and put unemployed people to work in new training programs as soon as possible. We're trying to give our school systems incentives to reach world-class standards with grassroots reforms and give them the support they need to do it. All these things are on the plate this year. We're going to try to pass a comprehensive welfare reform bill that will end the welfare system as we know it and give people a chance to move to independence.

Finally, we are determined that this will be the year when finally America will join the ranks of other advanced nations to provide comprehensive health care to all of our citizens. *[Applause]* Thank you.

There is one of your citizens here in New Hampshire to whom we owe a special debt of gratitude, and I want to acknowledge him today and that's Dr. Everett Koop, who was, as all of you know, Surgeon General under President Reagan and who lives here in New Hampshire and who works here and has been of enormous help to the First Lady in the work they have done conducting forums throughout the country, trying to get doctors

and nurses and medical centers involved in developing this health care plan and making sure it will work. He has played a major role in that, and I am very grateful to him for that.

You may have seen in the press reports, my wife was out in Colorado yesterday and had huge crowds of students at Boulder, with big signs saying, "Give 'em health, Hillary." Make no mistake about it, some of the people who are giving me hell in Washington are doing it so I can't give you health. But I'm going to try to give you health and take whatever it is they want to give me in return for making sure you get what it is you're entitled to.

Now, I'm anxious to answer your questions. But let me just make a point or two about this. New Hampshire has a lot of strengths in terms of the health care you already have that many other States don't. And so you may say, "Well, what's in this for us?" You have, for example—only about 5 or 10 percent of your people don't have access, physical access, to good medical care. Most States as rural as New Hampshire have a far higher percentage of people who don't even have access. You have one of the finest immunization programs in the country. You've already done a lot of what the rest of the country needs to do in community-based mental health services. There are a lot of things that you can be very proud of. You have a higher percentage of your people who are insured and therefore, a lower percentage of your people who are uninsured.

So you say, "Well, what do we get out of this?" First, there will be no more uncompensated care, so the people who are providing health care will have some reimbursement because everybody will have insurance. Second, the people who are covered by Medicare but aren't poor enough to be on Medicaid, the kind of people I met at the Moe Arel Center, will, for the first time, have access to prescription medicine. And we'll phase in support for long-term care over and and above and in addition to nursing home, so that there will be some support for in-home care or community-based care.

This is very important. The fastest growing group of Americans are people over 80. And more and more people over 80 are quite vig-

orous and quite able to live good and full lives but may need some support. Over the long run, if you look at the population trends in this country—where we are going with our age groups—over the long run, we will save money if we provide a broader range of long-term care support and enable people to be as independent and as strong as they can for as long as possible. You will benefit from that.

The other thing I think is terribly important—I had a wrenching encounter at the hotel this morning, just before I left to come over here, where a woman came up to me with tears in her eyes, just crying, and she said, "My husband just lost his job, and we have preexisting medical conditions in our family and I do not know how we are going to get insurance." Even if you have insurance today, the only people who know they can't lose their insurance are people who work for employers that aren't going out of business and aren't ever going to lay anybody off. Everybody else is at some risk of losing their insurance, until you get old enough to get on the Medicare program. And that is a serious problem, because we have—I don't know how many people I've met in this State—we've got millions of Americans who have someone in their family who's been sick before and have a preexisting condition and, therefore, either can't change jobs for fear of losing their health insurance, can't get insurance now because they've fallen through the cracks, or pay higher rates. So even here in New Hampshire, I assure you, there is something to be gained from having a system in which everyone always has some basic health insurance.

We are going to work very hard to make sure we don't mess up what you're doing right here and give the States the flexibility they need. But we still deal with the fact that we have not solved this problem as a country. And I can tell you that we will never get the deficit erased, we will never balance the budget, and we will not restore long-term health to this economy or security to our people until we face this problem.

So these are the things that are going to gather the attention of the country this year. And they will command the attention of the people of New Hampshire. I hope you will continue to debate and discuss them. And

let me say again, as I open the floor to questions, this is the way I think public life ought to be conducted. I love the town hall meetings I had in New Hampshire in 1991 and 1992. And I never fail to be inspired by the fact that they were so different from the tenor and tone of political debate and discussion in the Nation's Capital. My guess is they still are, not because there were no debates, no arguments, no disagreements but because they were about big things. They were about you, your future, and your children, and that is, after all, what we ought to be about. Thank you very much.

Is this on? Questions? How are we going to do this? First of all, let's identify the microphone holders. Who's got the mikes? Stand up; raise your hands. All right, I'll tell you what. I think we will do—I'll just start over here, and we'll just go around the room and then turn around and go back again. Why don't you pick someone?

Community Service Programs

Q. President Clinton, with the new community service bill giving money to individual States, how would a city like Nashua be able to receive funding, and how could individual groups get involved in this?

The President. Well, each State will have the opportunity to certify a community service group. So if, for example, if you've got a community service group in Nashua where young people would like to do work before, during, or even after college and earn credit for education, \$4,750 a year while being paid to do the work a very modest amount. Then you just have to have your group certified. It's nonbureaucratic, it's done at the grassroots level, and each State has a community service operation that is related to the national community service effort.

So that's all you have to do to get approved. Then you get approved, then you say how many people you want, who want to be in the community service program and want to qualify for the aid, and then we just have to—we will fill up the slots every year, basically as the approvals come in, and everybody will be approved until we run out of positions. We've got 20,000 positions this year; we'll have 100,000 positions the year after next. I hope that this thing becomes so popu-

lar that we'll get up to a half million a year. That's my goal. I hope we'll have a half million young people every year in community service projects, earning credit against their education. If we do, we will solve an enormous number of problems in this country with no big Government bureaucracies but with the power of people at the grassroots level. So we're going to try to keep it very nonbureaucratic like that.

Health Care Reform

Q. I wanted to ask what would happen to someone in the health plan that has insurance already but exhausts it because of pre-existing conditions. How will they benefit from your program?

The President. If you have insurance now—what did you call it?

Q. It's exhausted?

The President. It's exhausted?

Q. Well, mine isn't at the time, but I'm worried about it in the near future.

The President. You're worried about running up against the limits.

Q. Exactly.

The President. Yes. About three-quarters of all health insurance policies have what are called lifetime limits, which means if you get real—maybe there's an aggregate amount of \$1 million, let's say, so that you could lose your health insurance under your existing policy, even if it's a good policy, if you get real sick. Now, a lot of insurance companies under the present economic setup feel like they have to do that because they're relatively small companies, they have a relatively small number of people insured, and they just don't think they can afford it.

Under our system, we abolish lifetime limits and we end discrimination against people for preexisting conditions, but we don't bankrupt insurance companies writing health insurance, because we also go to something called community rating. I want to level with you about this, because some of you will pay a little more. Basically, young, single workers will pay a little bit more for their health insurance so that older people and families with preexisting conditions aren't discriminated against. But that's very important because you're going to have people in their fifties and sixties changing jobs in this environment.

I met a man from upstate New York the other day who had a job in a defense company for 29 years. He was 59 years old; he changed jobs and went to work for a hospital. So we're going to go to something called community rating, which means people will be insured in very large pools, and that's how we'll be able to afford to guarantee that you will not come up against your lifetime limits. There will be no lifetime limits without bankrupting the insurance industry; everybody will be insured in great, big pools. It's much fairer.

Young, single, healthy people will pay slightly more but not a great deal more, and it will permit us not to discriminate in rates against older people and people who had an illness in their family.

Q. I'm a resident of Nashua, New Hampshire. I have a comment and then a question. The comment is, and I'm 68 years old, Whitewater is for canoeing and rafting. Shame on those who would detract and distract from the important work you're doing with universal health coverage and jobs. And now my question. I have a former husband and two sons with major or chronic mental illnesses. I'm a member of the Nashua Alliance for the Mentally Ill. I've been on the board of the New Hampshire Alliance for the Mentally Ill, and I'm a member of the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill. And I would like to join Rosalyn Carter and Betty Ford in asking and urging that we pass Parity for People With Mental Illness in the health bill that you're proposing, now, not in the year 2001. And finally, I'm also a volunteer the Nashua's new, one-year-old Neighbor To Neighbor Clinic, which provides health care for those who have no health insurance. We want to go out of business, and we need your help.

The President. Bless you. Let me also say that in regard to the mental health comment you made that in addition to Rosalyn Carter and Betty Ford, that position is most strongly urged in our administration by Tipper Gore, who is a real mental health advocate and has done a wonderful job on this issue.

Let me explain what the problem is to everybody else. This health care plan basically has a guaranteed set of benefits, which means that every plan after this, if you have a plan

that gives these benefits or gives more, you won't be affected. If you don't have any insurance or your insurance doesn't provide some of these benefits, then the benefits would have to be included if the bill passes. The principle new things we do that often-times aren't in health care plans are primary and preventive things, tests like cholesterol tests or mammograms or things like that, things that we believe save a lot of money over the long run, primary and preventive care.

We also begin to phase in alternatives to nursing home and long-term care, as I said. And we phase in full parity for mental health benefits, as she noted, up to the year 2000. The mental health community says, and by the way, I think they're probably right, that you ought to start with full mental health coverage as soon as all other coverage is phased in. You know, if it takes 2 or 3 or 4 years, whenever you put all the other stuff in, put mental health in right then and you will probably save money on it.

Now, let me just explain what the problem is, because, in principle, I agree with you. But any bill I pass—any bill the Congress passes, as Congressman Swett can explain, has to have a price tag on it that has been certified by the bipartisan or nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office. They have to say, "Here's how much the bill will cost, here's how it's going to be paid for, and here's why it won't increase the deficit." That's the law under which we're operating now.

The problem is that under the budget rules, no one knows—we know how much mental coverage will cost, but we don't know how much it will save. So, to try to get full parity, we went—I didn't—the First Lady and her group went to 10 different actuaries to try to get the best possible figures we could get on what mental health coverage would cost. And we couldn't ever get a consensus that the Congressional Budget Office would buy.

I'm not trying to paint them as the bad guys, by the way, they're not the bad guys; they just don't know. So what we may have to do is to start off with the mental health benefits phased in, then show what the costs are of the new things we're doing, and if

they're lower than they're projected to be, then we can accelerate the time which the full coverage comes in. That's the only possibility that I see right now because of the budgetary problem we have.

And this is a problem, by the way, we face in lots of other areas where we're doing something we know will have a good benefit, but we can't prove it. I'll give you another example so it might be clearer to you. When we passed the North American Free Trade Agreement for trade with Mexico, everybody said it would increase trade with Mexico and jobs in the short run, everybody said that. Even the people that weren't for it thought it would increase jobs in the short run. But we had to count it as a net negative for the budget because we had to reduce tariffs which weren't coming in. So we counted all the losses; we could count no estimated gains from increasing sales.

So if some company from New Hampshire sells more in Mexico, it earns more money and pays more Federal income tax, right? We couldn't count any of the estimated increase in Federal income tax; we had to count all the losses. That's what happened in mental health, which is the problem I'm facing. If we can figure out a way around it, we'll try to accelerate the coverage. But it's a budgetary problem. You're absolutely right. It has to be done, but better it be done in 2000 than not at all. And I'll try to figure out how to do it quicker.

Who's got the mikes here in this column here? Let's do a couple here.

Unemployment

Q. The job training concept proposed for the unemployed and welfare participants, in principle, is an excellent idea. However, currently there are a large majority of recent college graduates, myself among them, who are underemployed. What does your administration plan to do about broadening the middle tier of the job market so that there will be jobs for those who complete your job training programs, as well as job opportunities for college graduates?

The President. I think there are two things that we have to do. First of all, I should have said this earlier, even though 30,000 new jobs have been created in New Hamp-

shire, almost all in the private sector, in the last 13 months, it would take about another 20,000 jobs to get you back to where you were in 1988 or 1987 with the growth in population. The truth is, we're going to have to have more jobs created here. But I noticed—I don't know if I still have it—there was a column in the Manchester newspaper, which is not exactly the house organ of the Clinton administration—[laughter]—talking about how many new jobs are coming into the State, particularly in the southern part of the State and particularly with smaller businesses. So I think the truth is, for young people with no previous experience to be able to get into a good job market, we're going to have to have probably about 15,000 or 20,000 more jobs created here. But I think we're well on the way to seeing that happen.

The second thing that I'm trying to do—we had a job-training conference in Washington, and then we had this meeting in Detroit yesterday—where I'm trying to make a real plea in this environment against age discrimination on both ends. In other words, there are a lot of people who won't hire young people because they only want to hire people who have had experience. Well, how are the young people ever going to get any experience if nobody ever hires them? And there are a lot of people who don't want to hire older people because they say they've got too much experience, they're too old. But if you're going to—in the environment we're in, where the average person will change jobs eight times in a lifetime, we are literally going to have people changing jobs in their sixties. So employers are going to have to have a whole change in attitude about who is a potential good employee. I think that's something we're really going to have to talk through as a country and deal with.

But the most important thing we can do is just try to keep generating more jobs, because that's how—because younger people without previous experience have a tougher time breaking into the markets if there are still people 10 years older who are unemployed from the last recession. We're getting there, but we're not quite there yet.

Health Care Reform

Q. I'm a recovering Republican. [*Laughter*] We made you the "Comeback Kid" a few years ago, and we hope to send that message from this town meeting to Mr. Dole and his friends in the media, that we're very focused, the people are very focused. We're concerned with jobs and health care. And my question is very focused on health care. My husband's job just changed to HMO's, and they chose for us the doctors that we would see. I had to leave the doctors in Salem and go to Massachusetts to where the HMO was. In your health care plan, will I have more freedom to choose and maybe go back to my own doctors that I've used—a specialist I've used for my son, who is disabled and myself than I do now with this HMO?

The President. Yes. The short answer is yes, but let me explain. Let me try to explain. The short answer is yes, but let me try to amplify it a little bit because I don't want to be misleading in any way. If we do nothing, if we walk away one more time from this health care crisis, what's going to happen is more and more employers will turn to HMO's because they have to to pay their medical bills because the cost of medical care is going up 2 and 3 times the rate of inflation. Many of these HMO's will do an excellent job and will be widely supported and be well and warmly received. Some of them will be not so well received because people either won't want to give up their personal physicians or especially if they've had—you mentioned you had a son with a special problem—if they've had someone that required special treatment, they'll have a particular anxiety about that.

Now, if our plan were to pass as it is today, here is how your situation would be different. Your employer could choose to do work with the HMO and could point out that the HMO would provide all the services required in the health care plan and could even provide a discount for it, that is, could give you a financial incentive to do it. Under our plan, every year you would be given at least three choices—at least three choices: this HMO; some other plan, let's say a PPO, a group of doctors get together and offer their services and maybe would let any other doctor, including your doctor, sign on if he would

agree to give the services at the same price; and then strict fee-for-service medicine, the situation you have now. You might have to pay a little more, but your employer would still have to make a contribution. So you would have those choices.

In addition to that, we are trying to set up in our plan the situation where, if someone has a specialist like you do for a special problem, if the specialist will provide the service for the same price that the HMO specialist will provide it, then the specialist should be able to provide that even if you go to the HMO. So you could maybe do the—[*applause*—so you could maybe get a compromise. We're working on that.

But I don't want to kid you. The employer would still have the option to pick an HMO, and that would still be a less expensive option than the fee-for-service. But you would be able to get the fee-for-service, and your employer would have to make the same contribution to that plan as he or she would to the HMO. So you would have much more choice than you have now.

Right now—I think it's important that everybody understand this—right now, most people who have insurance are insured in the workplace, and only about half, actually slightly fewer than half have any real choice of providers today who are insured through the workplace. So the amount of choice is going down.

Now, as I said, there are some very, very good HMO's. New England has some very good HMO's that have done a terrific job. But a lot of people want to have the choices. Under our plan, we will promote and facilitate the growth of good HMO's because there will be economic incentives for people to compete for lower cost but higher quality medicine. But we will protect the choices people have, which are vanishing at a very rapid rate today. We're really trying to work out the specialist problem, because that's the thing people are most traumatized about. Someone has been taking care of a family member with a special problem and have to give it up; it's really tough on them.

Q. I come from a town called Amherst, where I'm a distinct minority, I'm a Democrat. [*Laughter*] And my husband and I have just become editors of a small news letter,

and we sent you a copy to the White House, as a matter of fact. I'm concerned about health care because I'm one of those people with lots of preexisting conditions and my husband is a contract engineer and insurance doesn't come with his job. I'm afraid when I hear news reports of you having to compromise to get this bill through Congress. I'm afraid that one of the things you may have to compromise on is people like me. Is that so?

The President. No, there will be no compromise on everybody being covered. There's no point in doing it if we're not going to cover everybody. There is no point in doing it if we're not going to cover everybody. But what I want you to understand, I want every one of you to understand that there are consequences to all human behavior, including inaction. We all know that, but sometimes we forget it.

If we do not act, certain things will happen. Some of you will go into HMO's and you'll be very well satisfied and you'll get good health care at lower costs. Some of you will go into HMO's and you'll lose your choices of doctors and you'll feel that quality has suffered and you'll be frustrated and angry. Some of you will lose health coverage because every year we lose about 100,000 people a month in the United States who lose their health insurance permanently. And every year, at some point during the year, there are over 50 million of us who don't have any health insurance.

So what I want you to understand is I won't pretend to have all the answers; I don't pretend that we're right about everything. This is a complicated subject. But there are consequences to every course of action, including doing nothing. And they are quite significant, the consequences of doing nothing.

It also means, to go back to the lady over there, it means no mental health coverage; it means no medicine for people on Medicare but not on Medicaid; it means no medicine for working families who have health plans that don't cover medicine now, may have kids with high medicine costs.

So the one thing we have to do is to find a way to cover everyone, which means you can't lose your coverage because you have preexisting conditions. And in my judgment,

it means that people who work for small businesses or who are self-employed should have access to insurance at more or less the same rates that those of us who work for Government or big companies do.

I don't think people who have access to the Federal plan, which is terrific by the way; it's a cafeteria plan. Any of you who are Federal employees, you know that. I mean, we've been able to manage our costs. Some of our plans have even gone down in price this year. We have all these choices. I don't think people who work for the Federal Government who don't know anybody else or talk to them can possibly imagine the level of insecurity that grips people that don't have this level of certainty. That may be one of our problems now in Washington.

But the answer to your question is, if we're not going to cover everybody, if we can't find a way to find universal coverage, there is no point in doing this. That's what I said in my State of the Union speech. I'm very flexible; a lot of people have good ideas. A lot of people have better ideas, perhaps, than I do on certain things. We may have to be flexible to pass a plan around the edges. But we have to provide coverage for everybody. Otherwise we haven't done what we set out to do.

Q. Mr. President, I have a certificate of appreciation from you for being in the Marine Corps, and I was wondering if you could sign it for me.

The President. You bet. I'd be honored to do it. I might say—I like this guy. He meant sign it right this minute, no delay. [Laughter] Thank you for your service, Corporal.

Foreign Aid

Q. First of all, Mr. President, I'd like to thank you for your accomplishments in the past year. I think we all appreciate it. And my question is pertaining to foreign aid. I'm a little puzzled as to how we can be sending such large figures out in foreign aid, for instance, \$300 million per year to Israel, when we need funding for our own domestic programs for our own people and for deficit reduction.

The President. Let me say, first of all, I don't want to hedge this, I want to try to disagree with you, and I want to tell you that

I have—this is something on which I have changed my mind more since I have become President than before. And I want to try to explain why. But let me first say that even though we give quite a lot of money in foreign aid, it is a tiny percentage of our overall budget, and the United States gives a far smaller amount of its public money in foreign aid than any other Western country. All the major European countries and Japan give a higher percentage of their budgets to foreign aid than we do. We give less than others. Now, in our defense that's because we spent more on national defense defending the whole world during the cold war. So we spent a bigger percentage of our income on defense than any of those countries. So we did more.

But let me explain why, if I might. If we can, through the judicious use of this aid, succeed in making peace between Israel and the PLO, the Palestinians, the Syrians, the Lebanese, the Jordanians, we will remove the huge possibility not only of another war, which could send a lot of children from New Hampshire off to fight, but also of spreading terrorism and weapons of mass destruction arising out of that troubled part of the world.

Give you another example: Turkey is a very important country to the United States. It's a tough issue. Every time—we have a system which says the Turks and the Greeks don't get along, so we give them both money at the same time. And they are very important to us, both of them, but they don't get along with each other. But Turkey is a secular Muslim country, that is, it is not a fundamentalist country. They have allowed us to try to save the Kurds when we went to war in the Persian Gulf; they helped to support us. By a modest amount of money there, if we can continue to relate to those people and support economic growth and opportunity there, they may save another war 4 or 5 years hence.

If we can help to build the economies of the democracies in Latin America, we spend a little bit of money to support democracy there, then all those countries may wind up buying products from New Hampshire and New England and creating jobs for us. We're going to have a Summit of the Americas in December in the United States, and all the heads of all these democratic countries in

Latin America are coming up. They all want to be our trading partners. They want to buy more from us. They don't ask much from us, a tiny amount of support for doing that.

So can you waste money on foreign aid? You bet we can. Do we have higher priorities here at home than a lot of things we may do? Yes, we do. Do we need to spend some money on foreign aid in order to protect our security interest and our economic interests long-term and diminish the threat of terrorism and the spread of weapons of destruction? I believe we do. And I see it now much more clearly, in all candor, than I did when I was a candidate running. Sitting in the office, I have a totally different view of it than I did before I came.

Go ahead. We'll take one or two more. The principal called the assembly to order, and can call it off, I think.

Deficit Reduction

Q. I've heard you speak about the decline in the deficit over the last 3 years. My concern is that, as we go further into the nineties, the projections are for it to start to increase again. I've been very taken with the Concord Coalition, with New Hampshire's own Warren Rudman and Paul Tsongas and their proposals. I would heartily hope that you would work to continue to reduce the deficit and not reverse the trend that you have started.

The President. Thank you very much. Let me just make a comment about that. You're absolutely right about that. Let me try to explain or amplify on what you just said. The estimates are—if this budget that I have now presented to the Congress passes, we will have 4 years of declining deficits in real dollar terms. If they adopt this budget, it will be the first reduction not only in defense spending but discretionary domestic spending since 1969 that I have presented. Don't ever let anybody tell you that Democrats are the big spenders. I've asked them to cut spending over last year, the first time since 1969.

Now, it does start to go up. And Senator Tsongas and Senator Rudman and Pete Peterson and the Concord Coalition group, what they believe we should do is to do something to restrict the increases in expenditure on Social Security, which are growing, as well

as on Medicare and Medicaid. But let me explain to you why I think we should deal with the health care issue first.

Social Security expenditures are about the same percentage of Federal spending as they were 20 years ago. There is a cost of living increase associated with Social Security, but it's been more than covered by the increases in the Social Security tax. So here's what your budget looks like. Defense is going down; all the domestic programs are flat. That means if I propose spending more on education and more in new technologies for former defense firms to make money in commercial enterprises, I have to cut one dollar in something else for every dollar I've put in there. So, no increase in discretionary nondefense spending, a decrease in defense spending, Social Security is going up, but at the rate of inflation; and the revenues are covering it—the Social Security tax.

So what's going up? Well, interest on the debt is going up, but at a slower rate now because interest rates are down. The thing that's going up now, and the only thing really going up in the whole Federal budget is Medicare and Medicaid going up in 2 and 3 times the rate of inflation. And the reason for that is that people are being constantly—pressures are being constantly dumped into those programs because we don't cover everybody and we have no system to bring health care costs in line with inflation. So I believe the next big step, if you want the deficit to keep coming down, is to try to bring that problem under control.

The Congressional Budget Office, even though they disagreed with our cost figures in the first 3 years, say that 10 years from now, our health care plan will be saving the Treasury \$150 billion a year, a year. So you're absolutely right, if we don't do something else, we can't keep the deficit coming down. I think the next something else should be the health care.

Yes, there's a gentleman over here. I don't want him to think I was stiffing him.

Q. Mr. President, I want to apologize to you. I do not have a question, but I want to tell you—when my many friends over in the southwestern part of the State—you're on the right track. Don't let the people on the other side of the aisle give you all that

rhetoric. They're all running for office, and you're going to come out on top in the long run.

The President. Bless you. Thank you all very much. We've got to quit. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:55 a.m. at Elm Street Junior High School. In his remarks, he referred to Pauline Caron, principal, Elm Street Junior High, and Mayor Rob Wagner of Nashua. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Exchange With Reporters in Nashua March 15, 1994

Q. Does it make you angry?

The President. No, but let me show you something. Look at this. This is what people care about. Here's a child with a preexisting condition. He can't get health insurance. So I went out there, was shaking hands in the crowd, the mother gave me a picture of this child. That's where America is, with these people—

Q. Why do you think it's been so hard for you to get your message to—

The President. I haven't been out here with them.

Q. [Inaudible]

The President. You can draw your own conclusion about that, but you heard from a lot of wise people here today.

Q. Are you angry, Mr. President? You sounded awfully angry last night.

The President. I wasn't. I was happy. What I said last night, I was not angry, but I'm determined. That was a deliberate—I wanted to tell those people how I felt. And I'm very happy being here today. This is America; this is where they are.

Q. It sure looks like you started the '96 campaign—

The President. It's not about the '96 campaign; this is about what we're going to do in Congress for the American people in 1994. That's what this was about.

NOTE: The exchange began at approximately 11 a.m. outside Elm Street Junior High School. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks to Employees of Markem Corporation in Keene, New Hampshire
March 15, 1994

Thank you very much. First, thank you, Jan. She did it like a real pro, didn't she, just as if she'd been there her whole life. Give her a hand. *[Applause]*

I want to thank Jim Putnam for that fine tour and for his remarks. I also want to recognize your Congressman, Dick Swett, who is with me, who's made the tour with me, and he's been a real friend to this company. He's been telling me about Markem for a long time and telling me that I should come here. And I'm very glad I took the suggestion. I had a great time today, and I thank you for that.

I want to thank Jim for the tour and all of you who welcomed me along the way and showed me the work you're doing. It's very, very impressive. I appreciate the message that was read from Tom Putnam and the fact that he's opening new markets for you in another part of the world. I know there are other leaders of this company: Jim Baute whom I met today, and Dave Putnam who's not here. And I thank all of you for giving me a chance to see something that is very important for America to think about today, which is how people work together in partnership and win in a tough global economy.

Mayor Lynch, I want to say I'm glad to be back in Keene today, and with you, Senator, and all the other people that are here. This community and this county have been very good to me. Cheshire County gave me more votes than anybody else on the ballot in the primary here in 1992 and in the general election. And so I'm indebted to the people of this community and this county.

Yesterday I was in Detroit, the center of our country's automobile industry, a place that is full of change where, first, thousands and thousands of jobs were lost in the car industry, and now, automobiles are coming back and other industries are coming back in and around there. We had leaders of the world's seven large industrial nations meeting there—Canada, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, and the United States—talking about an interesting phenomenon

which is the difficulty all the wealthy countries are having creating jobs in a tough global economy, even when their economies are growing. It's not a problem confined to America. And I asked for this meeting last summer so that we could begin to plan together what we could do to reward the work of our people and to try to cooperate more with one another even as we compete.

One of the things that we know is that there are some things that work, and you live it here every day. This is an old company that, as Jim said to me on the tour, keeps young by looking always to the future, being always willing to change, a company that's had, as I understand it, no layoffs in four decades, and that goes through a long recession in the 1980's. That's something you can be proud of. Would that every company would do that.

And it's obvious that you have a combination here of good management, strong workers, good partnership between the people who work here and the folks in management. You're keeping on the cutting edge of technology. I saw the computer change the two different labels for my visit here today, not with any plates or anything but with simple software. And a real commitment to open markets: I thank Jim and his company for their support of our attempts to open more markets to American products through the North American Free Trade Agreement with Mexico, through the new worldwide trade agreement, through the outreach we're conducting to Asia.

One of the things we know is that a rich country can't grow richer unless it finds more customers for its goods and its services. And I am committed to finding more customers and to making sure that we have a chance to sell in every market in the world. I was encouraged at the Japanese that, after years of conversation and controversy you've finally worked out an arrangement to give our cellular telephone companies, Motorola specifically, access to the entire Japanese market.

We don't want any favors. We just want a chance to sell American wherever people are willing to buy American. I think that's what we ought to want and what we ought to insist on. If we let other countries have access to our markets, we should ask for the

same thing in return and give you a chance to compete in the global economy.

Since I became President, I have worked on a coordinated economic strategy designed to give you a chance to do well by opening more markets to exports, because export-related jobs pay 22 percent more on average than jobs that have no connection to the global economy, by trying to improve the economic climate in this country, bringing interest rates down and increasing investment, by bringing our deficit down.

Last year, the Congress approved a deficit reduction plan to reduce our deficit by \$500 billion. This year's plan has just been approved in its outlines by the House of Representatives. And if it passes, and I believe it will, we'll have 3 years of constant reduction in our Government deficit for the first time since Harry Truman was the President of the United States. And it's paying rich dividends for the economy of America and New Hampshire. The unemployment rate in this State has dropped 1.5 percentage points since the election of 1992, 30,000 more jobs in New Hampshire.

But there is a lot more to do, and I ask you to work with me to make sure we do these things properly, and I just would mention three things if I might. First of all, we have to continue to harness technology to the future and make the best technologies available to all of our people. One of the ways we're doing that which has benefited some in New Hampshire already is by taking some of the money that we're reducing defense spending by and putting into domestic technology development so that a lot of the defense companies can find ways to hold onto their jobs by making nondefense products.

Another thing we're trying to do that Jim Putnam has been an expert about—in fact, he's closer to Vice President Gore than I am in what he knows about it—and that is the information superhighway. We want to hook in companies like this one but also every library and every public school and every hospital in the United States of America into a vast information network, fueled by high technology to make information readily, quickly, inexpensively accessible to all the American people. This can explode our economic opportunities and improve our quality

of life. And your company and your leader are on the cutting edge of that. We intend to continue to push it.

Second thing we want to do is try to improve the continuous training opportunities for America's workers. Unfortunately, as you know, very few companies have a no-layoff policy, and a lot of companies in a dynamic economy simply don't make it at all. Most of the new jobs being created in America are being created by smaller employers, but they have a record of not only coming into business in a hurry but often going out of business.

That means that we need to change the whole unemployment system, because frankly, companies pay unemployment taxes into a fund designed for an economy that doesn't exist anymore. Most people who lose their jobs today don't get their old jobs back the way they used to. They have to find new jobs, which means, instead of maintaining people in idleness for a protracted period on unemployment payments that are inadequate anyway, we should use that money immediately, as soon as people lose their jobs, to begin to immediately retrain them so that they can get jobs in companies that are growing with a better future that require higher skill levels. We should turn the unemployment system into a reemployment system. That will be a heavy priority for the Congress this year.

The last thing I'd like to talk about briefly is health care, for a couple of reasons. First of all, I know this company has a good health care package and, therefore, that you all feel secure in your health care. And I honor you for that, and I'm glad you do. But you should know that every major company in America like this one that provides good health care to its employees is paying more for that health care than it should because so many Americans don't have any health insurance, and when they show up at the hospital at the emergency room, their health care gets absorbed by the hospitals, and they pass the cost on to the companies that do have health insurance. That adds to the cost of doing business.

It also means that a lot of Americans are at risk of losing their health insurance all the time. So what we're committed to doing this year is to preserving the plans that are good,

like yours; preserving what works in the American health care system, but fixing the system of finance which has led a lot of people into very difficult circumstances.

I just left a town hall meeting in Nashua, where I talked to a woman who lost her health insurance because she had a sick child and because she lost her job, and now nobody will hire her because they don't want to take her son's insurance on because the child is sick. In any other country they would have a broad, big pool in which people like that could be insured, so no company would be unduly burdened by hiring an employee.

With people changing jobs seven or eight times in a lifetime, we have to make it possible for all American families to work and to have access to health care. And we can't stop people from moving in the job market just because they've had a child or a parent who was sick. And furthermore, it is not right when we are trying to export our products all over the world to punish good companies that provide good health insurance benefits by making them pay more than they should just because some people don't pay anything.

So we're going to try to provide health security for all Americans in a way that preserves what is right about our system but fixes what is wrong. It will be good for the economy, and I can also tell you it'll be very good for this budget deficit, because every year, now the only thing that's really growing in the entire Federal budget are health care costs going up at 2 and 3 times the rate of inflation for reasons directly related to the fact that we're the only advanced industrial country that doesn't provide health care to everyone. So we have to do that, and I hope you will support that.

Finally, let me say that one of the things that I'm trying to do as your President, with mixed results, I guess, is to bring the same sort of values and method of operation that made this company great into the operation of the National Government.

So many of the problems that we have today are people problems. They don't fit neatly within the partisan political categories of the past. So much of what we have to do today is to get people to work together in teams to develop human potential and to exalt human dignity and give people a chance

to live up to the fullest of their God-given ability. That is our job, to get people together, to get things done, to help people make the most of their lives.

And I think that we do very well in Washington, DC, to remember the model that we see here. The model that puts people first: no layoff policy, heavy emphasis on productivity, use technology, but never forget people are the most important thing. Sell to the whole world. Keep the competition in mind. Those are things I wish we could be driven by in Washington. And I promise you, every day I'm trying to bring Washington a little closer to that way of doing business, your way.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:17 p.m. on the factory floor. In his remarks, he referred to Janet Morse, employee, James A. Putnam, president, Thomas A. Putnam, chairman, David F. Putnam, director emeritus, and Joseph A. Baute, director, Markem Corp.; and Mayor William F. Lynch of Keene.

Remarks to Soldiers and Their Families at Fort Drum, New York

March 15, 1994

Thank you for the wonderful welcome. Thank you for this beautiful, beautifully decorated place of welcome. Thank you for letting the band play "Yakity Sax." That was an interesting little twist. And thank you for letting me sit next to a distinguished soldier who was from my hometown—our grandparents knew each other—Command Sergeant Major Johnson, stand up. You know, we were sitting back there talking, he was looking at me thinking, I don't know about you, Mr. President, but I've come a long way. [Laughter]

I thank all of you for being here. I also want to acknowledge the presence in the audience today of the Lieutenant Governor of New York, Lieutenant Governor Stan Lundine, and Congressman John McCue from this district. Thank you, gentlemen, for being here.

I also want to thank the eight couples that are here behind me and Major Tony Smart, who was sitting up there with me. The nine

of them gathered over at General and Mrs. Meade's house a few moments ago to talk to me about what it was like to be in Somalia and what it was like to be the family members left behind. They represented you wonderfully well. I loved my time with them. And it must not have been all that easy for them to do, but they were terrific. I'd like for you to acknowledge them all. *[Applause]*

I thank General Meade for his welcome and General Shali for his fine remarks.

You know, this is a great day, but it is March 15th and there's still a couple of feet of snow on the ground up here. I know that there are a fair number of men and women in our Armed Forces who come from the southern part of the United States. When I realized you'd had 160 inches of snow, 26 days in January below zero, one day at 43 degrees below zero—that's real temperature, not wind chill—I'm surprised we have anybody who didn't go to Somalia. *[Laughter]* I'm surprised anybody stayed behind. Some of the ladies who were meeting with me said that shoveling the snow was maybe a harder duty than their husbands had to endure. But I'm glad to be here. I thank you for the hat. Look at my nice tie, here. It's your tie. I will wear it with pride.

It's also a privilege for me to welcome back "Triple Deuce" today. I say on behalf of all the American people, thank you, job well done and welcome home.

Fifteen months ago, our troops went to Somalia to help stop one of the great human tragedies of our time. Already 300,000 people, many of them little children like those here in this audience, had died of starvation and disease; twice as many were in danger of dying very quickly. Relief supplies were rotting on the docks of Mogadishu, hostage to a small number of armed Somalis.

To help relieve this suffering, our Nation acted. President Bush deployed 28,000 American troops in support of a United Nations humanitarian mission. It was after the election, I was coming in, and I gave him my full support. Joining with other soldiers and relief workers from around the world, our troops helped restore hope and save hundreds of thousands from certain death. This proud division, the same division that helped the citizens of Florida rebuild after Hurri-

cane Andrew, knows something about restoring hope. I saw some of you there, too.

Today, in Somalia, the crops are growing; food and medicine are flowing; roads, schools, and clinics have reopened. No longer are thousands of children dying every day. Leaders are sitting down today at peace talks in Nairobi. You helped make all that possible. And by March 25th, a week ahead of schedule, the last American military units in Somalia will be heading back to their loved ones and home.

There are those who will say we have not done everything that could have been done because Somalia has not yet found an enduring peace, because factions continue to fight for advantage, indifferent to the deadly chaos they threatened to recreate. But never forget, because of your efforts and the efforts of so many others, the starvation has ended and the Somali people have been given a serious chance to build their own future.

That is all we or anyone else can provide. We cannot rebuild other people's societies. You have given them a chance to seize their own future. That is what we do in the United States, and that is what others must do as well. You have given them that chance, and for that, the world should be grateful to you.

Let me say that we must honor not only those who returned hale and healthy but also those who came home wounded and those who did not return. I met in Walter Reed Hospital one of your numbers, Sergeant Chris Reid, a very brave and terribly impressive soldier who is still in the hospital nursing his wounds. And I know that our prayers, all of our prayers are with him.

Just yesterday an American AC-130 crashed off the coast of Kenya on its way to Somalia and several of the crew members perished. On behalf of all the American people, let me express our sympathy to the loved ones of those who were lost in that accident.

On Veterans Day I had the honor of meeting three other members of your great division—Specialist Michael Carroll and Duane Bevitt and Lieutenant Colonel Egon Hawrylack. They came to the White House. I thought I deserve a cheer for pronouncing his name right. *[Applause]* Let me tell you, they came to the White House, those three people, with some others who served there,

with a simple message. They said, "We are proud of what we did." When most of our troops came home last May, General Robert Johnson came to the White House and he said this about you and your colleagues who served in Somalia, "A lot of 18- and 19-year-old men and women in uniform," he said, "demonstrated enormous discipline, good judgment, and a good deal of patience in performing a rather unique mission."

That is putting it mildly. People who were not there do not know how much patience was required on how many circumstances under difficult, difficult conditions. And General Johnson said, "I don't think any other country in the world could have done what we did." I say that is true, and we are all proud of what you did.

In this new era, you all know that we may ask our military to undertake a range of missions, fighting aggression in the Gulf, helping to contain the conflict in the Balkans, working to build a democratic peace in Europe through NATO's Partnership For Peace. But whatever the setting, our people in uniform carry the same message of strength and hope and freedom.

That's why our forces must always be the best trained, the best equipped, the best prepared in the world, and the people with the best spirit, the best morale, and the deepest conviction. People like you. That is my commitment, to keep you there and keep you strong.

I want to say one other word about the mission in Somalia. General Shalikashvili just described that work as a great victory as measured in the thousands and hundreds of thousands of children and men and women who are alive today. In that sense, the mission you undertook was without precedent. American soldiers did not go to Somalia to conquer but on a mission of mercy, a mission accomplished, a mission to be proud of. Let history also record that here at Fort Drum and at other bases across our Nation that it was not just the troops who earned their stripes but the spouses, the families, the children, the civilian colleagues and the communities.

I want to say again, I am profoundly grateful to all the families and all the family support groups and all the civilians who made

this possible. And these fine people behind me, who spent about an hour talking to me today taught me things and made me see things and understand things from your point of view that I could never have learned otherwise. I am in your debt, and I believe I will be a better President and a better Commander in Chief because of the time they spent to share your lives, your experiences, and your hopes with me. I thank them for that, and I thank you for that.

Finally, let me say, if there are any debates still to be had about our mission in Somalia, let people have those debates with me, but let there be no debate about how you carried out the mission. You answered the call. You did your job. You served your country wonderfully well. More than that no one can ask. So to all the American men and women who have served with honor in this difficult and dangerous mission, I say you have shown the world what Americans are made of. Your Nation is grateful, and your President is terribly, terribly proud of you.

Thank you. God bless you, and God bless America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:02 p.m. in the soldiers' gym.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Report on International Agreements

March 15, 1994

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. Chairman:)

Pursuant to subsection (b) of the Case-Zablocki Act (1 U.S.C. section 112b(b)), I transmit herewith a report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Claiborne Pell, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Nomination for Commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission

March 15, 1994

The President today announced his intent to nominate Susan Ness as a member of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC).

“As a former communications leader, Susan Ness brings to the FCC valuable perspective. Her extensive experience covers many communications industry sectors including telecommunications, radio, television, cable television, programming and publishing,” the President said. “She will be an excellent addition to this important Commission.”

NOTE: A biography of the nominee was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary.

Memorandum on the White House Conference on Small Business

March 15, 1994

Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies

Subject: White House Conference on Small Business

In September, I appointed the White House Conference on Small Business Commission. The Commission is charged with convening a series of State and regional meetings that will culminate in a national White House Conference on Small Business in June 1995.

These 66 meetings will attract up to 40,000 participants who will discuss the challenges facing small businesses. These representatives—small business owners and entrepreneurs—will develop specific recommendations for executive and congressional action. These recommendations will help constitute the small business agenda for the 21st century.

I ask each of you to support this important effort, by taking the following measures. First, each department and agency should prepare a list of significant policy initiatives affecting small businesses undertaken in the past year. Second, each department and agency should identify one or two potential

new initiatives that would improve the economic or regulatory climate for small businesses. These two items should be forwarded to Gene B. Sperling, Deputy Assistant to the President for Economic Policy, no later than April 1, 1994.

The White House Office of Cabinet Affairs, working with the National Economic Council staff, the White House Office of Public Liaison, and the Small Business Administration, will coordinate various departments’ and agencies’ participation in the Conference. To facilitate that process, please designate a deputy-level contact on your staff to serve as a liaison and to work directly with the White House offices and the Small Business Administration. Each liaison will be asked to attend regular meetings and charged with oversight of the department’s or agency’s contribution to and participation in the Conference. Please forward your designee’s name to Christine A. Varney, Deputy Assistant to the President for Cabinet Affairs, by April 1.

Thank you for your support of this important effort to assist our Nation’s small businesses.

William J. Clinton

NOTE: This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on March 16.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the “Reemployment Act of 1994”

March 15, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit today for your immediate consideration and prompt enactment the “Reemployment Act of 1994”. Also transmitted is a section-by-section analysis. This legislation is vital to help Americans find new jobs and build sustainable careers.

Our current set of programs was designed to meet the different needs of an earlier economy. People looking for help today confront a confusing, overlapping, and duplicative tangle of programs, services, and rules. Job seekers—whether unemployed or looking for better jobs—have a difficult time getting the information they need: What bene-

fits and services are available to them? Where can they get good quality training? What do they need to know to find and hold good jobs and to build sustainable careers?

The underlying problem is the lack of a coherent employment and training system. Instead, we have many disconnected, category-based programs—each with distinct eligibility requirements, operating cycles, and program standards. We need a true system of lifelong learning—not the current hodgepodge of programs, some of which work, and some of which don't. The legislation I am transmitting today is an important first step in building this system.

We need to build a reemployment system because our current unemployment system no longer delivers what many American workers need. In the past, when a worker lost a job, he or she often returned to that job as soon as the business cycle picked up again and the company was ready to rehire. The unemployment system was designed to tide workers over during temporary dry spells. Today, when a worker loses a job, that job often is gone forever.

Our economy has generated new jobs. In 1993 alone, 1.7 million new private sector jobs were created—more than in the previous 4 years combined. While the jobs exist, the pathways to them aren't always clear.

The Reemployment Act of 1994 strives to fix this. It is based on evidence of what works for getting workers into new and better jobs. Programs that work are customer-driven, offering customized service, quality information, and meaningful choices. Programs that work provide job search assistance to help dislocated workers become reemployed rapidly, feature skill training connected to real job opportunities, and offer support services to make long-term training practical for those who need it.

The Act reflects six key principles:

First is universal access and program consolidation. The current patchwork of dislocated worker programs is categorical, inefficient, and confusing. The Reemployment Act of 1994 will consolidate six separate programs into an integrated service system that focuses on what workers need to get their next job, not the reason why they lost their last job.

Second is high-quality reemployment services. Most dislocated workers want and need only information and some basic help in assessing their skills and planning and conducting their job search. These services are relatively simple and inexpensive, and they have been shown to pay off handsomely in reducing jobless spells.

Third is high-quality labor market information, which must be a key component of any reemployment effort. The labor market information component of the Reemployment Act of 1994 will knit together various job data systems and show the way to new jobs through expanding access to good data on where jobs are and what skills they require.

Fourth is one-stop service. At a recent conference that I attended on "What Is Working" in reemployment efforts, a common experience of workers was the difficulty of getting good information on available services. Instead of forcing customers to waste their time and try their patience going from office to office, the new system will require States to coordinate services for dislocated workers through career centers. It allows States to compete for funds to develop a more comprehensive network of one-stop career centers to serve under one roof anyone who needs help getting a first, new, or better job, and to streamline access to a wide range of job training and employment programs.

The fifth principle of the legislation is effective retraining for those workers who need it to get a new job. Some workers need retraining. The Reemployment Act of 1994 will also provide workers financial support when they need it to let them complete meaningful retraining programs.

Sixth is accountability. The Reemployment Act of 1994 aims to restructure the incentives facing service providers to begin focusing on workers as customers. Providers who deliver high-quality services for the customer and achieve positive outcomes will prosper in the new system. Those who fail to do so will see their funding dry up.

The Reemployment Act of 1994 will create a new comprehensive reemployment system that will enhance service, improve access, and assist Americans in finding good new jobs. This is a responsible proposal that is fully offset over the next 5 years.

I urge the Congress to give this legislation prompt and favorable consideration so that Americans will have available a new, comprehensive reemployment system that works for everyone.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
March 15, 1994.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on March 16.

**The President's News Conference
With Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin
of Israel**

March 16, 1994

The President. Mr. Prime Minister, friends, we come together today at an important time for the Middle East. We are closer to a lasting peace than would have been thought only a year ago. Yet we are further from that peace than we expected to be only a month ago.

The events of the past several weeks have demonstrated the risks in this great undertaking. The bloodshed in Hebron was a tragic reminder that the forces of reaction will lash out whenever peace becomes a real possibility. We must not let the enemies of peace triumph. We must not allow them to deny Israel and its neighbors a future of hope. And that is why I applaud Prime Minister Rabin's courageous stance against militant extremism. And it is why I have called upon the Prime Minister and Chairman Arafat to find a way to resume negotiations and to do so quickly.

Today we discussed ways to put the Israeli-Palestinian negotiations back on track. We agreed on the need for concrete measures to ensure security for Palestinians as well as for Israelis and for rapid implementation of the Declaration of Principles to give Palestinians control over their own affairs and well-being.

In our meeting, the Prime Minister and I also discussed ways to make 1994 a year of breakthrough in the negotiations between Israel and Syria. This would not only help bolster the agreement already achieved with the Palestinians, it would also help advance

our overall objective of a comprehensive peace, one that encompasses Jordan and Lebanon as well.

President Asad spoke in Geneva of his strategic choice for peace with Israel. Prime Minister Rabin told me today that peace with Syria is a strategic imperative. These two leaders have a great responsibility to the people of their region. As a full partner in the process, the U.S. stands ready to help them achieve that lasting peace that can end the Israeli-Arab conflict and transform the Middle East.

The Prime Minister and I agreed that as the region turns to the business of establishing peace, the Arab boycott of Israel must end. It is a relic of the past, born of animosity and exclusion. For all the peoples of the Middle East to prosper, economic barriers and isolation must yield to dialog and cooperation.

During our meeting today, we also discussed what the United States can do to maintain and enhance Israel's security as it continues to take real risks to achieve peace. We talked about ways the U.S. could help Israel defend against long-term threats to its security. And I reaffirm my commitment to work with Congress to maintain our present levels of assistance and to consider how we might help Israel defray the costs of peace. We've also pledged to do whatever we can to help resolve the cases of Israeli MIA's.

Since the beginning of this administration, the Prime Minister and I have worked to promote the common interest and values our nations share. Today we are working closely together on such issues, including those which now confront the U.N. Security Council. Our efforts have one common purpose, maintaining the principles we both share while doing all we can to promote peace.

This is an historic moment for Israel. And I am profoundly aware, Mr. Prime Minister, of the great burdens you are bearing in your search for peace. You have the admiration and respect of the entire United States and our Nation's pledge of support and steadfast friendship.

As we approach Passover, a time to celebrate freedom and redemption, let us dedicate ourselves to a season of new beginnings

and turn our gauge to the future to make it a future of peace.

Thank you.

Prime Minister Rabin. Mr. President, the Vice President, Secretary of State, dear friends, it was important and worthwhile to meet today with the President and his team, to know and appreciate what we have known for a long time, the friendship and trust between our two countries are profound and now as good if not better than they have ever been. We could not ask for more.

For this, Mr. President, please accept our gratitude. It is good to know that a great nation blessed with values and democracy stands with us for the greatest battle still to come, the battle for peace.

Mr. President, a few months ago, I stood here with you and many others at an historic occasion. We arrived at the beginning of the end of the bloody struggle that has lasted for 100 years. It was clear from the beginning that in spite of the good will on all sides, it would be difficult to bridge in days or in months differences in positions, perceptions, points of view, and hatred that have devastated and grown over so many decades. But we shall overcome these difficulties and reach the day of peace. We shall remain determined in our goal.

In our talks today, I told you, Mr. President, that in my view, we were near the finish line of the talks with the Palestinians on the first stage of the Gaza-Jericho first. Some problems and details have yet to be solved. I am sure that we shall find the right solution once the negotiations are renewed. We will not let the extremists derail the peace process.

On behalf of the state of Israel, I condemn the terrible terms of the killing in Hebron. I repeated this today in our conversation. Since that time, the Government of Israel has taken tough measures that are unprecedented in Israel. We will implement them with determination.

But, Mr. President, we are also victims of terror, whether organized or spontaneous. Our women and children have lived in the shadow of terror for decades. Not a week passes that we don't have to bury our dead. And if only for this reason, we don't think it appropriate to wage new demands after

every terrorist attack. Security is a two-way street. Real leadership must rise above the realities of the day, even if they are painful and bloody, in order to arrive at our strategic goal. Peace is not a tactical option but a strategic objective which takes precedence over everything else.

With you, Mr. President, I call on Chairman Arafat of the PLO to resume talks immediately and act like me, to fight terror as if there were no negotiations and conduct the negotiations as if there was not terror.

We have to complete the negotiations so that in the spring or in early summer, hundreds, thousands, tens of thousands of Palestinians in Gaza and Jericho will at last be able to conduct their own affairs. We don't seek to rule them anymore.

Mr. President, there is no time to waste. We feel that the window of opportunity that opened after the Gulf war is narrower than we thought. Time is running out. Therefore, 1994 has to be the year of great decisions in the peace process. In this framework we spoke of the options that can be presented to President Asad in order to achieve peace with Syria. I hope that President Asad will respond appropriately, and we shall be able to sign a peace treaty by the end of this year. President Asad said that Syria had made the strategic choice for peace with Israel. That was encouraging. Peace with Syria has always been our strategic choice. We recognize the importance of Syria to a comprehensive peace in the area. We are ready to negotiate peace with Syria that takes account of our mutual needs and interests. There must be give and take on both sides.

We know that as we engage in serious and authoritative negotiations, the point will come where painful decisions will have to be made. The promise of peace and its genuine benefits for all Israelis justifies making such decisions vis-a-vis Syria. We will not compromise on our security. But we will stand ready to do what is required of us if the Syrians are ready to do what is required of them.

At the same time, we would like to promote and advance the negotiations with Jordan as well as with Lebanon. We are hopeful that with them, too, treaties of peace can be achieved this year.

All of us know the time for the Arab boycott of Israel, a remnant of a period of hate and rejection, should be lifted. Mr. President, Prime Ministers of Israel have come in the past with impressive shopping lists. On my list today, I have one item alone, the pursuit of peace.

As Passover, our feast of freedom, is approaching, let me take the opportunity to remind all of us of the fate of the Israeli soldiers missing in action and prisoners of war. I would like to thank the President for the United States support in this regard and express the hope that Passover will also be a time of redemption for them. Mr. President, thank you very much.

The President. Thank you.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. Prime Minister, since security is a two-way street, what do you plan to do to wipe out the acknowledged double standard in the treatment of Palestinians? And also, if you're willing to make peace with Syria, Lebanon, Jordan now why don't you make the quantum leap and go for permanent negotiations on peace with Palestinians instead of the step-by-step, very slow struggle of the peace process that means more strife?

Prime Minister Rabin. First, about the second question. You have to refer to the letter of invitation to the Madrid peace conference. This letter of invitation served as the basis agreed on by all the parties that were invited to the Madrid peace conference and the negotiations that followed this conference.

What was written there that the purpose of the negotiations with the three neighboring Arab countries beyond Egypt would be to achieve peace treaties and with the Palestinians to move by two phases. Phase number one, something that was never offered to the Palestinians in the past, not by Jordan when Jordan was in occupation of the West Bank, not by Egypt when Egypt was in occupation of the Gaza Strip, we offered them self-rule to run their own affairs, to have a Palestinian council, self-governing authority as an interim agreement.

What was agreed in signing between the PLO and us in the Declaration of Principles that was signed on the lawns of the White

House? We divided the phases by agreement to Gaza-Jericho first; then to create the overall arrangement, and not later than 2 years after the completion of the implementation of Gaza-Jericho first, to start negotiating a permanent solution.

I believe that sometimes what might look the shortest way is the longest and the one that will not lead to a change in the realities. Therefore, we are committed to the letter of invitation to the Madrid peace conference. We are committed to the Declaration of Principles that was signed here between the PLO and Israel. We are committed to the Cairo agreement that was reached between the PLO and Israel. And I believe to be committed to agreements that were reached is a basic precondition for the efforts to reach more agreements.

Second, you talked about different situations. Let's face it, most of the terror attacks are aimed against Israelis. We, the Government of Israel, in accordance to the international law, are the sovereign, true military government of the territories. It's our responsibility for the safety, the welfare of all the residents, Jews and Palestinian alike. This government, as a result of the terrible tragedy that took place in Hebron, has taken measures that are unprecedented in Israel vis-a-vis those who violate the law.

But we are a lawful country. I can give you an example. I used my responsibility as a Minister of Defense—orders for administering detention of two Israeli residents, not the territories. But in accordance to our laws, they have to be approved by a president of a district court. I ordered administrative detention for 3 months. The president of the district court reduced it to 6 days. I cannot violate the verdict of the court. Whatever the government does comes under the supervision and decision of our courts.

I believe that many people in Israel believe that what we have done is almost encroaching the line of the law. But we are determined to do within the law whatever is needed to fight terrorism from whatever direction it will come.

The President. The question from the Israeli press.

Q. The two alternative issues—[inaudible]—Jerusalem and settlements, are now

de facto on the table. Do you agree that they should wait until the final stage or should you tackle them right now?

The President. You are asking me?

Q. I am asking both of you, Mr. President and Mr. Prime Minister.

The President. Well, in terms of the resolution of Jerusalem, the position of the United States has not changed. But that is a matter for the parties to decide in accord with the declaration. It is something to be ultimately decided at a later point. That's what we think should be done.

Prime Minister Rabin. My answer is basically simple. We signed here in Washington the Declaration of Principles. It is written very clearly there that issues that have to be settled once we negotiate permanent solution will not be dealt with now. And it is written very clearly as examples for this kind of issue: Jerusalem, settlements, borders, refugees and others. Therefore, by agreement with the PLO, these issues will be dealt with when we negotiate permanent solutions.

Terry [Terence Hunt, Associated Press].

China

Q. Mr. President, I'd like to ask you about China. There are growing calls for the United States to de-link the issues of trade and human rights. Former Secretaries of State Vance and Kissinger say the United States has to pay attention to human rights but that it also has to have a pragmatic approach. What are you getting out of your current strategy or your current approach to China? And are you thinking about changing it?

The President. Well, I think you can safely assume that we have been and will continue to be spending a good deal of time on the issue of our relationships with China, that our policy is what it has been, that human rights are important, but the other issues are important, too. And I'm confident that we will be able to work through this and strengthen our relationship and our advocacy of human rights over the long run. That's what I think will happen, and we've got some time to do that. And I think you'll see an enormous effort coming out of this administration to try to achieve both those objectives.

Is there another question from the Israeli press?

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, are you going to urge the President of Syria to meet with the Israeli Prime Minister? And did you ask the Israeli Prime Minister the question, if Israel will be ready to leave the Golan Heights to get peace with Syria?

The President. We had quite an extended conversation about this issue, and I believe that the Prime Minister very much wants to make peace with Syria. I talked with President Asad just a few days ago. I'm convinced he wants to make peace with Israel. Since I think both of them want to make peace with each other, the best thing for me to do is not to say anything which will make their task more difficult.

Q. But we need details, Mr. President.

The President. Yes, but they can't come from me.

Q. Mr. President, I'm wondering if you could describe what your view is of the concrete measures that you mentioned early on in your remarks that should be taken to keep peace in Israel, and whether or not you would support the PLO idea for a police force in Hebron?

The President. I think the Prime Minister would like to respond to that also, but let me say, Israel has accepted responsibility on the security issue for law and order, if you will. And even the United Nations in the draft that is being circulated has reaffirmed that. Within that broad framework, I think there are a number of options which can be pursued to deal with this issue. And I think the Israelis have an obligation, as I have said, to come up with some specific initiatives for reassurance on this.

I also think it is important for the PLO not to use this as an excuse not to return to the peace talks. I think the Prime Minister is doing what he can to demonstrate his good faith, has been very firm in reaction to the massacre in Hebron. There are some specifics that have been discussed. I think they will be forthcoming. But I don't think that we should get the two so mixed up that the whole future of the Middle East is, in effect, put on hold.

You like to——

Q. So does that mean you don't support the PLO's presence there, sir?

The President. Well, that's not what I said.

Prime Minister Rabin. Well, allow me first to make it clear. In the agreement, once it will be reached and signed, there is a building—in the past it was 8,000 to 9,000 men as a Palestinian police force in Gaza and Jericho. If by now agreement has been reached, by now there would have been 8,000, 9,000 Palestinian policemen in Gaza and Jericho. The more the negotiations are postponed, the longer it will take them to come.

Second, even if there will be some Palestinian police—and there were in the past, at least 900 Palestinian police in the territories were Palestinian residents of the territories in Hebron and in Ramallah and in—[inaudible]. They resigned because of the Intifada. As long as ours is the overall responsibility for the territories under the military government, using our civil administration, their presence will not relieve us from our overall responsibility.

Therefore, we have to look at it in the context of what is our international and practical responsibility. We, as long as agreement will not be reached that will cover all these areas with the PLO, we will remain internationally responsible to the security of all those who reside there, if there will be or will not be part of any Palestinian police. They will have to come under the control of the government there, and the government is the military government of Israel. Therefore, you can't have separate armed groups. There must be one chain of command of those who have to keep and maintain law and order.

Russia

Q. Mr. President, the Israeli Government is seemingly uncomfortable with the sort of involvement that the Russian Government has sought to assume lately in the Middle East process. Are we seeing increasingly a phenomenon worldwide in which Russia, in the way of making a point that it is still a great nation and deserves recognition, gets in the way of restoring stability back in the Middle East, the Balkans, Central Europe, and elsewhere?

The President. I don't think they have gotten in the way of restoring peace and stability in the Balkans. I think that so far they have been a constructive force. They are a cosponsor of the Middle East peace talks and, therefore, have a right to have their say. I think it is very important, however, if I might turn your question back just a minute, that as a cosponsor, insofar as possible, that we coordinate our actions together and that anything they do is not seen as an obstacle to peace but facilitates it. And the answer to your question, basically, will have to be revealed by the conduct of the Russians themselves in the days and weeks ahead.

I think when we were attempting to get the safe zone around Sarajevo and get the talks back going in the Balkans, the Russians were basically a positive force. Whether they will be such in the Middle East will be revealed by their own conduct in the days and weeks ahead. I hope they will be, and we certainly are willing to coordinate with them. You know, they were here when we had the signing in September, and I have always appreciated the fact that they were a cosponsor of these talks.

Press Secretary Myers. Two more questions.

The President. Brit [Brit Hume, ABC News].

Whitewater Investigation

Q. Do you and Mrs. Clinton still stand by the conclusions of the so-called Lyons report on your real estate investment in Whitewater, or are you uncomfortable with those findings?

The President. Look, I don't have anything else to say about that right now. We are cooperating fully with the special counsel, which is what all of you asked me to do. I wish you'd let them do their work.

Yes.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, do you think that Jews should exercise their right to reside in the middle of Arab cities? And, Mr. Prime Minister, could you also respond to that?

The President. What was the question?

Q. Should Jews exercise their right to reside in the middle of Arab cities in the West Bank? Should they live in Hebron, for instance?

Prime Minister Rabin. I don't understand the question.

Q. Well, there were ideas of evacuating Jews from the middle of Hebron, for instance.

Prime Minister Rabin. Again, as part of the DOP that we signed with the PLO, it is said very clearly that the settlements remain there for the period of—the interim period. I'm not saying it. It is written very clearly in the DOP. Therefore, since it was agreed, I don't see at this stage as a condition for anything even to discuss this issue.

Ames and Pollard Spy Cases

Q. Mr. President, I wonder if you could tell us, and Mr. Prime Minister, the extent to which you've discussed the Jonathan Pollard case again, and how much, if at all, the Ames investigation has interfered with action on it that was presented as imminent several months ago.

The President. We did not discuss it. And the Ames case has not interfered with it inasmuch as the Pollard case is already in the hands of the Justice Department, and the White House is awaiting a recommendation from the Justice Department.

Thank you.

Q. Could you let the Prime Minister answer?

Prime Minister Rabin. In today's meeting the issue was not brought up.

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The President's 53d news conference began at 1:11 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to President Hafiz al-Asad of Syria.

Memorandum on Sanctions Against Serbia and Montenegro

March 16, 1994

Presidential Determination No. 94-16

Memorandum for the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury

Subject: Drawdown of Commodities and Services from the Inventory and Resources of the Department of the Treasury to Support Sanctions Enforcement Efforts Against Serbia and Montenegro

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by section 552(c)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, 22 U.S.C. 2348a(c)(2) (the "Act"), I hereby determine that:

- (1) as a result of an unforeseen emergency, the provision of assistance under Chapter 6 of Part II of the Act in amounts in excess of funds otherwise available for such assistance is important to the national interests of the United States; and
- (2) such unforeseen emergency requires the immediate provision of assistance under Chapter 6 of Part II of the Act.

I therefore direct the drawdown of commodities and services from the inventory and resources of the Department of the Treasury of an aggregate value not to exceed \$4.5 million to support international sanctions enforcement efforts against Serbia and Montenegro.

The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to report this determination to the Congress and to arrange for its publication in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

Nomination for Director of the Voice of America

March 16, 1994

The President today announced the appointment of Geoffrey Cowan as the Director of the Voice of America (VOA) at the U.S. Information Agency. Cowan will serve as the 19th Director of VOA, the international radio broadcasting service of the U.S. Information Agency. His father, Louis

G. Cowan, served as the second Director of VOA, from August 1, 1943, to August 31, 1945.

“Geoffrey Cowan has been an important force in almost every facet of the communications world, as a public interest lawyer, best-selling author and award-winning teacher, playwright, television producer, and public servant,” said the President. “The Voice of America will be served well with another Cowan at its helm.”

NOTE: A biography of the nominee was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary.

Nomination for Chair of the African Development Foundation

March 16, 1994

The President today announced his intent to nominate Ernest Green as Chairman and member of the African Development Foundation.

“Ernie is a close friend whose contributions to the United States have already changed the course of this Nation,” the President said. “His talents will be a tremendous asset to this important foundation.”

NOTE: A biography of the nominee was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary.

Executive Order 12904— Commission for Environmental Cooperation, Commission for Labor Cooperation, Border Environment Cooperation Commission, and North American Development Bank

March 16, 1994

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including section 1 of the International Organizations Immunities Act (22 U.S.C. 288), and having found that the United States participates in the Commission for Environmental Cooperation, the Commission for Labor Cooperation, the Border Environment Cooperation Commission, and the North American Development Bank pursuant to the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act, Public Law 103-182, I hereby designate the

Commission for Environmental Cooperation, the Commission for Labor Cooperation, the Border Environment Cooperation Commission, and the North American Development Bank as public international organizations entitled to enjoy the privileges, exemptions, and immunities conferred by the International Organizations Immunities Act. This designation is not intended to abridge in any respect privileges, exemptions, or immunities that such organizations may have acquired or may acquire by international agreements or by congressional action.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
March 16, 1994.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 3:30 p.m., March 17, 1994]

NOTE: This Executive order was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on March 17, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on March 21.

Remarks Announcing Anti-Violence Public Service Announcements

March 17, 1994

Thank you very much, Alicia. I think your family is here with you—your family members, would you all stand up. Thank you for coming here with her. I want to thank Alicia for that remarkable performance. You know what I said to her when I saw the PSA’s? The same thing all of you are thinking, I said, “The one with you in it was a whole lot better.”

This is the culmination of a long effort by good people who want to do something about this terrible problem. I thank Phil Geier, the chairman of the Ad Council, and all those who comprise that Council and who support this work. I want to thank Jack Calhoun for the work he’s done and the 123 organizations that make up his Crime Prevention Coalition and for his remarkable remarks here today.

I thank Saatchi and Saatchi for the work they did and others, members of the Creative Community who are here with us today who have done their own public service announcements, changed their programming, made a common commitment in an earlier

meeting with the Vice President and me to try to make a sustained effort to change the culture of violence that is gripping our country.

I want to say a special word of thanks and greeting to the chairman of our Corporation for National Community Service, Eli Segal, who is in Miami at the 7th Annual Youth Crime Prevention Conference. With 1,200 officers, teachers, community leaders, and others active in crime watch projects, peer counseling, drug prevention programs and others, these people are going to have to carry a lot of the future of our common efforts to reduce violence in America.

You know, if you just read the big headlines in the papers today, a lot of them are very good. There's more growth, more jobs, more opportunity, a real sense of recovery in the country. But we will never become the country we ought to be if we lose another generation of our children to the violence that killed so many and holds the rest hostage.

I can tell you as the father of a teenager, every teenager in the country talks about this issue at home at night, discusses it over the dinner table, is concerned about it, worries about whether they have friends that are going to fall victim to crime. And this is an incredible burden, a burden you can see in the eyes and hear in the voice of Alicia, one that imposes on those of us who are grown an inordinate responsibility to change the conditions and the attitudes which have produced this incredible range of violence.

We now have a higher percentage of our people in prison than any country on the face of the Earth. No other nation has so high a percentage of their people in prison. And yet we worry that we don't have enough jail space and we have to build more.

The broadcast, the cable networks that are here who are supporting this effort and who will make time available are helping us to begin to make a difference. I want to say a special word of encouragement and thanks to them because they've done so much to help change our country for the better with other such campaigns, the campaign to reduce smoking, the campaign to increase seat-belt use, the campaigns to remind so many young people that a mind is a terrible thing

to waste, or friends don't let friends drink and drive.

President Roosevelt once said if he hadn't gone into politics he would like to have had a career in advertising. President Kennedy generated his first Peace Corps volunteers through ads like this. Messages can speak to dreams and respond to fears and bring people out of their shells. I hope that we can do that here today.

This industry, the entertainment industry, is working hard now to help America reduce violent behavior by showing young people that there are alternatives to violence. They can help us in the search for a safer and a saner land.

To change, people have to have a willing heart. We're working hard here on a crime bill which I hope so much will be passed soon to put more police officers on the street, to take more assault weapons off the street, to try to change the conditions in communities that exist by giving communities opportunities to help young people have something to say yes to instead of just something to say no to. But we have to have more willing hearts.

The cable industry will air these ads on 32 cable networks. The networks themselves have committed a high level exposure. Already 2,000 movie theaters have agreed to show the PSA on their screens. And we are now getting offers to put these PSAs on movies that are rented at video rental stores.

The Motion Picture Association of America, under the able leadership of Jack Valenti and the video software dealers are really going to do a lot of good work on this. These commitments are new and unprecedented. I think they reveal an understanding by people in the entertainment industry that our children have and share with us daily.

We somehow have to find a way to encourage young people to settle arguments with words instead of weapons. We also have to encourage their parents to do the same thing, for domestic violence is still the cause of a lot of these killings. We have to show adults how common sense can ease tensions. We have to help communities set up programs to deal with this.

Last week, I was in Brooklyn College with nine people who are giving their lives to var-

ious efforts to help people turn away from violence. I just want to mention two of them to you. I met a woman named Clementine Barfield from Detroit, who had two sons, two of her teenage sons shot, and one killed in gang fighting. She is devoting her life to try to reach kids to make sure not only that they don't become victims like her sons but they don't become killers like the people who killed her sons.

I met a young man named Sherman Spears from Oakland, California, who is confined to a wheelchair, has had one leg amputated, lost the use of one of his eyes, often still in pain because he was caught in the crossfire of a gun shooting. He is devoting his life to an organization which reaches out to victims and tries to tell them not to retaliate, not to seek vengeance, not to seek revenge, that no one ever gets even, and you have to go on with your lives.

These are the kinds of people we want to support. We will send specific suggestions to anyone who responds to the 800 line. It's 1-800-WE-PREVENT. It's mentioned in the ad, and it's very important because the people who are going to air the ads can't do the grassroots one-on-one work after the air is quiet.

In closing, let me just say this, you probably heard Alicia Brown say this, I want to reemphasize it. In a few moments, she is going to the funeral of her sixth friend to die from gunshot wounds, a 14-year-old child, not in a war zone in a far away country, not in Somalia, not in Sudan, not in Angola, not in Burundi, not in Sarajevo, but in the Capital of the greatest Nation on the face of the Earth.

That is what has become of childhood, my fellow Americans, While the rest of us have pursued our dreams in life, had our families, raised our children, enjoyed the fruits of freedom, that is what has become of childhood. It is indecent. It is unacceptable. We can do something about it. And we owe it to them to do it.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:30 a.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Alicia Brown, a 14-year-old student at Eliot Junior High School in the

District of Columbia. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks at a St. Patrick's Day Ceremony With Prime Minister Albert Reynolds of Ireland and an Exchange With Reporters

March 17, 1994

The President. It's a great honor for me to be spending my second St. Patrick's Day in a row with the distinguished Prime Minister from Ireland. He has a presentation to make and a few remarks, and then I'll have a word or two, and we'll answer your questions.

Mr. Prime Minister.

Prime Minister Reynolds. Thank you. Thank you, again, and I'm really thrilled and delighted and honored to be back again for a second visit to the White House, especially on this traditional day for all Irish people around the world.

In this presentation of shamrock that I'll be making in a few moments, Mr. President, we symbolize the bonds of family, of history, and of common values that our two countries share. Because of the generations of Irish people who have come to these shores, St. Patrick's Day is perhaps even more honored here than in Ireland. Rightly and most importantly, today is a celebration not just for Irish America but for all in this great Nation who share our common values of justice and democracy.

We live in a time when ambitions for peace are tempered by the realization that old animosities and deep distrust often live long in the human heart. They can give rise to terrible and prolonged violence. In this context it is both right and important that I should pay the warmest tribute to you, Mr. President, for your exceptional efforts to bring peace to the tragedies of Bosnia and the Middle East.

We in Ireland know from direct experience that conflicts over territory, identity, and political destiny can only be resolved through peaceful negotiations. That profound belief informs everything that my government and I are doing to resolve the problem of Northern Ireland. Twenty-five years of conflict, the loss of over 3,000 lives, and

an immeasurable quota of human suffering have not and cannot advance the search for a lasting and equitable settlement.

As you and I discussed, Mr. President, privately this morning, there has been significant progress in our search for peace. Central to this was the joint declaration signed last December by the British Prime Minister John Major and myself. This defines the common ground between our two countries on the issue of Northern Ireland.

At its heart, the declaration states that it is for the people of Ireland as a whole and alone, by agreement between the two parts, to exercise their right of self-determination on the basis of consent. That and the other principles of mutual respect, tolerance, and reconciliation which underline the declaration, do not have an expiring date. Rather, in establishing them, we have sought to open a door for all parties to embrace peace and enter the political process.

In our efforts to secure a lasting settlement, we wish, as I said, to embrace all parties to the conflict. We do so in the firm knowledge that the political process can and will resolve fundamental issues and bridge the impasse that presently blocks the road to peace.

It is our fervent wish, therefore, that violence will end and that everyone will embrace the new and inclusive instruments of peace, dialog, and negotiation, that are available. We need a positive decision from those concerned to enable a general move in the next and much broader phase of the peace process and to bring to an end the isolation experienced by significant sections of the community.

Mr. President, we greatly value your personal commitment to help to resolve the issue of Northern Ireland. Your support for this has been really inspiring. You share our understanding of the need to bring all communities fully into the political fold in a manner consistent with upholding democratic principles.

We take heart in particular from your readiness to contribute to the peace process when and if needed. It is an enormous source of encouragement to all of us devoted to peace and reconciliation to know that your advice and your assistance as a friend to all

sides is as thoughtful as it is generous. For that you have our deepest thanks.

Peace comes dropping slow, Yeats once said. But let us hope, Mr. President, that through our combined efforts, on a day in the quite near future, the presentation of shamrock will be made to you in the White House from an island uniquely dear to you and to your people that has at last found peace.

Mile buichos leat agus go n'airi an bothair duit.

The President. Thank you so much, Mr. Prime Minister, for the wonderful bowl of shamrocks and for the sentiments and the convictions you have just expressed.

From the earliest days of our republic the American dream has often been the story of Irish-American achievement. I'm reminded of the words of the Irish poet, Thomas Kinsella, who urged that we accept, and I quote, "no limit but the possible." That is the spirit that brought many Irish to our shores, and it enriches our lives still today.

Ireland has demonstrated its global commitment to peace time and time again. And I want to thank the Prime Minister publicly today for the work that has been done with the United Nations in Lebanon and with its continuing peacekeeping role in Somalia. But nowhere is that commitment more evident than in the efforts this Prime Minister has made in Northern Ireland.

We have seen historic progress since the Taoiseach and the British Prime Minister made their agreement, and historic progress since Prime Minister Reynolds was here last year. That progress is in great measure the responsibility of Prime Minister Reynolds and Prime Minister Major. They have dealt with considerable challenges in their own countries to pursue this course, and we applaud them.

The joint declaration they signed on December 15th remains the best chance for a future of tolerance and reconciliation in Northern Ireland, especially in the wake of the bomb threats against the London airports. I call upon all those who practice violence for political aims to lay down their arms. Once again, I urge those who have yet to do so to endorse the joint declaration as the best, indeed, the only way forward.

And once again, Mr. Prime Minister, I pledge the support of the United States for your courageous peace initiative.

Across our country today, in parades, in classrooms, in churches, Americans are rejoicing in the kinship and the unique friendship between our nations and our shared heritage and our shared values. Tonight the Prime Minister and I will join what promises to be a lively celebration of Ireland here at the White House, with Irish-Americans from all across America. I look forward to the celebration, and I look forward to working with the Prime Minister on St. Patrick's Day and every day in pursuit of peace and prosperity for both our peoples in the spirit of "no limit but the possible."

Thank you very much.

Northern Ireland

Q. Having been briefed now on the peace process today by the Irish Prime Minister, what would you say now is the role of the United States in helping the peace process along? And more specifically, do you think that you should perhaps urge Britain, not just Ireland, but Britain to go the extra mile, that maybe the extra inch now, and perhaps talk to Sinn Fein, which today has issued a very conciliatory statement saying it doesn't want to discuss constitutional issues but just simply wants to talk to see what the way forward can be?

The President. Let me say, first of all, I had a conversation with the Prime Minister this morning that is not all that different from the conversation I had with Prime Minister Major. I believe both of them are committed to keeping this process going. You know as well as I do what the obstacles for inclusion are. I was encouraged by the report I have received. I have not actually read the statement, but I am quite encouraged by the report I have received of Gerry Adams' statement today. It comes at a good time, and I hope it will have a good effect.

Q. Under what circumstances would you envisage granting another visa to Mr. Adams to visit the United States?

The President. I think it's premature to discuss that. I think now what the issue now is what is going to be the role of Sinn Fein in the ongoing peace effort. Will they join?

I hope they will. I still believe that the decision I made on the visa was the correct one. We all have to take some chances for peace. I think when he came here, he saw that the Irish in America want peace. They want him to be a part of the peace process, but they want peace. And I think that there was a sense of what a political process can be and how it can work.

And so I think we have served a good purpose in doing that. And I'm very hopeful. I'm more hopeful today as a result of the report I've received about his comments. But I think it would be premature for me to say anything about any other issuance, because the one thing we don't want to do in this country—not just in Northern Ireland but in the Middle East as well or any other place where we're working for peace where others are at odds—is to do anything to disrupt the process. We're trying to help make the peace, not to interrupt it.

Q. Would you address Irish-Americans today that may on St. Patrick's Day especially be listening to what is said here at the White House, who feel incumbent to contribute money to the IRA and for Republican forces in Ireland since a great amount of the money that goes into that is coming from the United States?

The President. I would hope all Irish-Americans would embrace the declaration and the peace process. That's what I think they ought to do.

Q. Given your role as President of the United States and given your relationship with the Taoiseach, Albert Reynolds, and also your relationship with the British Prime Minister, what active role do you think the United States can play in trying to find peace in Northern Ireland?

The President. Well, right now I think we ought to give Prime Minister Reynolds a chance to work with Prime Minister Major to keep pushing it forward. I thought that we had a role to play in the issuance of the visa because I thought it would make a statement that the United States is searching for peace, wanted to give Mr. Adams a chance to have his voice heard here, make his statements here, articulate his concerns here, see the political process here, and hear from Irish-Americans that we support peace. I

think that was the major thing that we could do at this moment. I think now we've seen a very heartening statement, apparently by Mr. Adams today. I've had both the Prime Minister of Great Britain and the Prime Minister of Ireland reaffirm their commitment to the process, and let's see if we get a few breaks.

Whitewater Investigation

Q. Mr. President, on the Hill today you may hear from some Members, even Democrats, that the prospect of hearings on Whitewater is inevitable. What will you tell them?

The President. That it's—the same thing I've always said: It's up to Congress. I read a book the other night that in the early part of our century, one of our first four or five Presidents, a \$40 mirror was bought for the White House that, was bought in another country, and the Congress in the early 1800's spent several thousand dollars on hearings looking into this \$40 mirror. So I don't know that—it's up to the Congress. They're an independent and coequal branch of Government, and they ought to do whatever it is they think is the right thing to do.

Bosnia

Q. Are you encouraged by Bosnia, sir?

The President. Yes, I am encouraged. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:59 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Gerry Adams, leader of the Sinn Fein. Prime Minister Reynolds' closing remarks in Gaelic translate as, "A thousand thanks for everything you have done, and I wish you every success."

Remarks at the Celebration of Ireland Dinner

March 17, 1994

We are in the grip of the day, aren't we? [Laughter] Thank you so much. Prime Minister and Mrs. Reynolds and to all our guests tonight, a warm welcome. *Ceade mile failte.*

Tonight we sought to honor the Prime Minister, his wife, and his family and his family of fellow Irish men and women, in a way inspired by the warm and convivial hospi-

tality of the Irish themselves that they have brought to our shores now through the ages.

There was a grand party in this house a long time ago, in 1829, when the first Irish-American was inaugurated as President of the United States. Andrew Jackson was the only President in our Nation's history whose parents were both immigrants to America. They came from Carrickfergus, a little town near Belfast. And their son grew up to be a great Democrat and a man of the people. When "Old Hickory", as he was called then, opened this house to his people, so many came that the furniture was crushed in the excitement. That's probably why so many of you have to stand tonight. [Laughter] The crowd squeezed so closely around the new President in the Blue Room just down the hall that he had to escape by jumping out a window.

Mr. Prime Minister, we will try to control ourselves better this evening. [Laughter] We promise that neither you nor I will be jumping out of any windows.

I wish I could recognize everyone here this evening of Irish descent. But perhaps I would do better to recognize everyone here who is not of Irish descent. [Laughter] I would like to say that the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, Carol Browner, is here tonight with her father, who is from Limerick.

When people think of Irish strongholds in America, they think of Boston or Chicago or New York. But many people from all over America, including my home region, come from Ireland. According to the 1980 census, Taylorsville, Mississippi, has a higher percentage of Irish-Americans than Boston. Of course, the total—I know what you're thinking—the total population is 24, but it still makes a great story. [Laughter] Actually that's not true. It's larger than that.

My own mother, as John Hume, a Member of Parliament from Derry said today, was a Cassidy. And he assured me today that the Cassidys back in Ireland are a very nice family. I thank him for that courtesy inasmuch as I seem to have relatives turning up all over the place from time to time. [Laughter] To the Irish who are here, relax, the Americans will explain it to you later.

Maybe I will jump out the window, Prime Minister. [*Laughter*]

This is the one day when we Americans remind ourselves that we are the sons and daughters of Ireland, both southerners and northerners, Catholic and Presbyterian, members of the Democratic and Republican party, although we still have a few more Irish on our side.

When the Irish toast each other, they say, "*Slainte!*", which we Americans always took to mean health. But the White House did some research on this, and I am reliably informed that in Irish, "*Slainte!*" actually means health care for all. [*Laughter*]

You won't believe this, but one of my erudite and overeducated staff members prepared another set of notes for me tonight—all in Gaelic. [*Laughter*] And I said, "It looks like Hail Mary and the Lord's Prayer." And he said, "That's exactly what it is." [*Laughter*]

So for a keepsake, I'm going to give the notes to the Prime Minister and say that if I could say but one prayer tonight, it would be for peace and reconciliation in Ireland. This is truly an era of profound change in our world. The Middle East is courageously trying to take steps toward peace. And we are doing our part. South Africa is weeks away from its first nonracial election. Tomorrow, here in the White House, we will witness the signing of agreements between Bosnians and Croats that advance the hope for peace in that troubled region.

Our Nation's long cooperation with Ireland has never been more important than today. In recent months, Prime Minister Reynolds and Prime Minister Major have tried to bring an end to a generation of troubles in Northern Ireland. Both have acted with vision and great political courage in putting forward the historic joint declaration last December. And Mr. Prime Minister, you and Prime Minister Major deserve our admiration and our thanks. And your declaration deserves the support of all people of good faith everywhere.

It is difficult to know what to make of the latest attacks at Heathrow Airport. Like the violence in Hebron or in South Africa, they may be a simple reminder that reactionary forces will always attempt to kill the peace whenever the progress and the prospect of

peace becomes a possibility. The United States condemns such acts, as it does all acts of terrorism. As Ireland searches for peace, I assure you that America remains steadfast in our support.

Our late Ambassador to your great country, William V. Shannon, whose wife, Elizabeth, is here tonight and who greeted us all, wrote a wonderful book called, "The American Irish", in which he included a beautiful and touching note on the immigrants who came to America from the shamrock shores of Eire. What did they seek, he asked? The answer is the same for them as for all. They sought a door that would open and give them access to hope.

Mr. Prime Minister, America has always been a beacon of hope to others around the world. But it is your pursuit of peace that is Ireland's hope today. When you return home, I hope you will tell the people of Ireland that we treasure the contributions the Irish have made to our country and its culture. And in return we stand with you, as you seek a door that would open and give all of Ireland access to the hope of peace.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:34 p.m. in the East Room at the White House.

Message on the Observance of St. Patrick's Day March 17, 1994

Warm greetings to everyone celebrating Saint Patrick's Day 1994. On this feast of the patron Saint of Ireland, we reflect on Saint Patrick's bravery and determination in delivering to the Irish people his message of faith and hope for the future—a spirit passed down through the many generations that followed.

With tremendous courage and strength of belief, Saint Patrick helped his native Ireland usher in a new era. Before Patrick returned to his island home as a Christian convert and missionary, Ireland was the last bastion of Celtic Europe. He encouraged the Irish people to adapt their ancient culture and deep spirituality to the new faith that had already transformed much of Europe. By bringing Christianity to Ireland, Saint Patrick her-

alded a new Eire and prepared his people to embrace the changing world around them.

In celebrating Saint Patrick's Day, our nation not only remembers the apostle of Ireland for his achievements, but we also honor the many contributions that Irish Americans have made to their adopted homeland. As inheritors of Saint Patrick's legacy, Irish Americans have strengthened the United States with the richness of their unique history. Blessed with educators and business people, political leaders and people of faith, our nation owes a debt of gratitude to this thriving community from the Emerald Isle.

As Americans everywhere gather to celebrate our "Irishness," I extend best wishes to all for a wonderful St. Patrick's Day.

Bill Clinton

Statement on Signing Legislation on Highway Bridge Retrofitting and Replacement

March 17, 1994

Today I am pleased to sign into law S. 1789—a bill that responds to January's earthquake in Southern California and will help States reduce potential losses from future earthquakes. This legislation expands the eligible uses of Federal bridge replacement and rehabilitation funds to include seismic retrofitting of highway bridges, regardless of whether the bridges are in need of other repairs or work. S. 1789 will greatly assist States in their efforts to reinforce bridges to better withstand earthquakes.

The California earthquake crippled much of the regional transportation system, serving as a sharp reminder of the vulnerability of our infrastructure to natural disasters and of the need to increase our preparedness for such events. The damage to the transportation network in Southern California had far reaching consequences. People's everyday lives were changed because of the difficulty of travel in the region, most notably in the time and effort spent getting to work. All levels of government immediately pulled together to minimize the disruption and resulting economic losses. That effort is continuing.

In my visits to the earthquake-damaged areas with members of my Cabinet and the Congress, one question was repeatedly raised: "We cannot prevent another earthquake, but can we prevent any of the resulting loss of life and debilitating infrastructure damage?" With regard to much of the damage to bridges and overpasses, the answer to that question is "yes." The California earthquake proved that seismic retrofitting works. None of the bridges in the Los Angeles area that were seismically retrofitted failed or suffered major damage as a result of the earthquake. The 12 bridges that were severely damaged during the earthquake had not been fully retrofitted.

The Congress responded quickly by providing much needed additional financial aid to victims of the earthquake through emergency supplemental funds. However, we need not only to provide assistance for repairs, but also to provide the flexibility to allow States to make sensible investments to prevent future losses.

I am very pleased that the Congress, led by Senator Boxer, has acted again to provide an additional tool to California and other States that may face similar natural disasters. This seismic retrofitting legislation does not increase Federal expenditures but allows States the flexibility to determine their own bridge needs. Together, these actions will not only speed recovery from the California earthquake but will also help mitigate potential losses to life and property in any State by future earthquakes.

S. 1789 will empower States throughout the Nation to make critically important investments in infrastructure to prevent highway bridge collapses. Ultimately, it will save both lives and dollars.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
March 17, 1994.

NOTE: S. 1789, approved March 17, was assigned Public Law No. 103-220.

Remarks at the Bosnian Federation Signing Ceremony

March 18, 1994

President Clinton. President Izetbegovic, President Tudjman, Prime Minister Silajdzic, Mr. Zubak, the Secretary of State, Mr. Lake, the Vice President and I are happy to be joined by you, as well as by others here today. We have the Deputy Foreign Minister of Russia Vitali Churkin. Representing the European Union Troika, the Foreign Ministers of Greece, Mr. Papoulias; of Belgium, Mr. Claes; of Germany, Mr. Kinkel, and of course, David Owen and Thorvald Stoltenberg, who have been the cochairs of the international conference.

In addition to that, we're very pleased to be joined by the Ambassadors to the UNPROFOR nations who have been so active in working for peace and in preserving the peace, General Shalikashvili, Ambassador Albright, and Members of the Congress. In the front row, Senator Lugar, Senator Stevens, Senator Levin, Senator Hatch, Congressman Lantos, and I believe Congressman McCloskey is here. There he is in the second row. So we thank all of you for coming today.

We have come to bear witness to a moment of hope. For 33 months the flames of war have raged through the nations of the former Yugoslavia. By signing these agreements today, Bosnian and Croatian leaders have acted to turn back those flames and to begin the difficult process of reconciliation.

Around the globe the tension between ethnic identity and statehood presents one of the great problems of our time. But nowhere have the consequences been more tragic than in the former Yugoslavia. There nationalists and religious factions aggravated by Serbian aggression, have erupted in a fury of ethnic cleansing and brutal atrocity.

The agreements signed today offer one of the first clear signals that parties to this conflict are willing to end the violence and begin a process of reconstruction. The accords call for a federation between Muslims and Croats of Bosnia. This Muslim-Croat entity has agreed on the principles of a confederation with Croatia. Together these steps can help support the ideal of a multiethnic Bosnia and provide a basis for Muslims and Croats to

live again in peace as neighbors and compatriots. The agreements are as important for Croatia's future as they are for Bosnia's. And it is the hope of all present today that the Serbs will join in this process toward peace as well.

These agreements are a testament to the perseverance and to the resolve of many people: the Croatian and Bosnian diplomats who kept probing for openings toward peace; the U.N. soldiers from many nations, here represented today, who have worked to bring both stability and humanitarian supplies; the NATO pilots who have helped put our power in the service of diplomacy.

I want to praise the leadership and courage of those who have come to Washington to sign these agreements, especially President Izetbegovic and President Tudjman. I also want to recognize the tireless efforts of Thorvald Stoltenberg and David Owen and, of course, our own Cy Vance, who is not here today, and especially to express my personal appreciation to the skilled diplomacy of Ambassador Charles Redman. Thank you, sir, for your work.

All of these people have done much to bring us to this point of agreement. Through Ambassador Redman's efforts and in many other ways, our administration has worked with our NATO allies, the European Union, Russia, the U.N. and others to help end this conflict. The fact that we have done this work together has made a significant difference. And to the Deputy Foreign Minister of Russia, I say a special thank you, sir, for your renewed energy in this area and our common hopes.

We have engaged in this work because the United States has clear interests at stake, an interest in helping prevent the spread of a wider war in Europe, an interest in showing that NATO remains a credible force for peace, and interest in helping to stem the terrible, destabilizing flows of refugees this struggle is generating, and perhaps clearly, a humanitarian interest we all share in stopping the continuing slaughter of innocents in Bosnia.

The documents signed here are only first steps, but they are clearly steps in the right direction. If they lead to an overall negotiated settlement, if a lasting peace takes hold in

this war-torn land, the ceremony will be remembered as an important event. Whether that comes to pass will depend less on our words today than on the actions of Muslims, Croats, and Serbs on the ground tomorrow and in the days to come.

For while documents like these can define the parameters of peace, the people of the region themselves must create that peace. Economic, political, and security arrangements for the new federation must be given a chance to work. The ceasefire between Croats and Bosnian Government forces must hold. Croats and Muslims who have fought with such intensity must now apply that same intensity to restoring habits of tolerance and coexistence.

The issue of the Petrinja region of Croatia must be resolved. Serbia and the Serbs of Bosnia cannot sidestep their own responsibility to achieve an enduring peace.

The new progress toward peace will likely come under attack by demagogues, by rogue riflemen, by all those who believe they can profit most from continued violence, aggression, and human suffering. Such attacks must be met with the same steadiness and leadership that have produced these agreements today.

Neither the United States nor the international community can guarantee the success of this initiative. But the U.S. has stood by the parties as they have taken risks for peace, and we will continue to do so. I have told Presidents Izetbegovic and Tudjman that the U.S. is prepared to contribute to the economic reconstruction that will bolster these agreements. And as I have said before, if an acceptable, enforceable settlement can be reached, the U.S. is prepared through NATO to help implement it.

All across Bosnia and Croatia communities and entire peoples were once connected by ancient bridges, like the great stone arch in Mostar, which for centuries stood as the city's proud symbol. Today, too many of those bridges have been reduced to rubble or closed by force. The challenge for parties to this conflict is to rebuild the bonds that those bridges represent. The announcement that Sarajevo's bridge of brotherhood and unity soon will reopen is a hopeful sign that the

parties can begin to span the divide of hatred and violence.

The work ahead is indeed daunting, but all of us in the international community are committed to help. Together, let us strive for peace.

Thank you.

Mr. Papoulias, the Foreign Minister of Greece, representing the European Union.

Foreign Minister Karolos Papoulias. Mr. President, Mr. President Tudjman, President Izetbegovic. The European Union warmly welcomes the agreement on the constitutional character for the future federation between the Croats and the Muslims of Bosnia-Herzegovina. This is a significant success coming shortly after the framework agreement signed in Washington on the first of March.

It is also a further step towards attaining a comprehensive solution in Bosnia-Herzegovina with the participation of the Bosnian Serbs, thus, safeguarding the territorial integrity of the country.

We congratulate the negotiators for obtaining results in such a brief time. We recognize that this would not have been possible without the active involvement of the United States administration.

Mr. President, the European Union has for some time now insisted that your country's involvement is crucial if a solution in Bosnia-Herzegovina and throughout ex-Yugoslavia is to be reached. We on our part have already covered a lot of ground. The two cochairmen of the International Conference on Yugoslavia have obtained, after lengthy negotiations, the agreement of the three parties on an important number of issues.

We believe that the understandings, especially on territorial percentages, should constitute the basis for further negotiations if we wish to achieve decisive progress soon. Moreover, our intention to contribute substantially to the implementation of an overall agreement by providing ground forces is still valid. So is our offer to obtain an administrator at a united Mostar for a period of up to 2 years.

Today's success reinforces the progress achieved during the last weeks towards a definite end of hostilities through the withdrawal of heavy artillery from Sarajevo, the

lifting of most obstacles to the flow of humanitarian aid, and the return, as far as is possible, of the population of Bosnia-Herzegovina to normal life.

In order to maintain the momentum, the European Union has already promised to dispatch additional forces for the strengthening of UNPROFOR in Bosnia.

From here on, we have to work hard, so that today's results are followed by further progress. We look forward to working closely together with the United States, Russia, and other countries involved, as well as with all parties to the problem.

Ex-Yugoslavia is a part of Europe. It is our responsibility and duty to participate actively in the efforts to achieve a peace settlement. Our presence here underlines our determination and our commitment.

Thank you.

President Alija Izetbegovic. Mr. President Clinton, Mr. Tudjman, Mr. Vice President Gore, Mr. Secretary, ladies and gentlemen, dear friends, particularly my friends from the Senate and the Congress of the United States, as well as many others who are present here and who have contributed to the signing of documents today, this is a great day for Bosnia-Herzegovina, but also to all those who are opposed to war—and peace between people. The document signed today is the result of the efforts of all people present here. I give them my thanks.

I am sure that all our friends, both in East and West, join me in expressing my gratefulness. Mr. Clinton, as well as Mr. Secretary, you have given a great contribution to what is happening today. The negotiations that led to the signing of this document have given this great result. The situation in Bosnia has improved. There are fewer victims.

Unfortunately, it is only occurring at one part of our country. Fighting continues around Brcko and Maglaj, and there is bad news from Brcko as well. There were some new conflicts in other areas of Bosnia. This means that our efforts for peace must continue without hesitation.

Our people want only two things, peace and justice. Or as they like to say, they like fair peace. Fair peace means that our country will keep its borders, and the villages and the cities from which our people have been

expelled will be able to resettle the refugees. Those who are responsible for war crimes will have to be brought to justice.

The most unfortunate of our people are our refugees and some of our member citizens which live in Sandjak. The refugees must return to their homes, and the violence in Sandjak must cease.

From Mr. Clinton's speech, I understood that the United States is ready to give their contribution to implementation of the peace agreement and reconstruction of our country. We accept this information with gratefulness and with pleasure. I pray to God to help our people as well as other people who fight for freedom and peace.

Thank you.

President Franjo Tudjman. Mr. Clinton, President Izetbegovic, Ladies and gentleman, the Republic of Croatia and the entire Croatian nation place the highest value on the efforts of the United States and of President Clinton in reaching the agreements of the formation of a Croatian-Bosnia federation and the further confederation with the Republic of Croatia. The signing of this Washington agreement marks a crucial turning point in the crisis in this region. And the positive outcome would not have been possible without decisive measures undertaken by the United States of America.

The historic step which has been taken today will be of immense mutual benefit for Croats and Bosniac Muslims, laying a strong foundation for lasting peace and a stable future in this region and assuring for both peoples full national sovereignty and full parity of equality in all state affairs. The further alliance with the Republic of Croatia guarantees the Bosniac Muslims prosperity in the federation, and so confederal ties with Croatia in a close association with the Western democracies.

However, in order to address adequately the widespread human and material destruction suffered by both republics, determined support is critical to restore a decent standard of living enabling the rebuilding of the historic areas and to return the displaced and the refugees to their homes. We look to the United States and the international community to assist us in these burdens so that the

harsh conditions under which our citizens continue to suffer can be alleviated.

The Republic of Croatia continues to care for the largest number of refugees and displaced persons, relative to population, in the world. It is our hope that these agreements, coupled with the commitment of the international community, will create the conditions necessary for lasting peace and the return to normal and productive life for all our citizens.

The Republic of Croatia wishes full integration into regional European economic and security systems, as well as comprehensive cooperation with other international institutions, all of which will contribute to the success of our endeavors. Croatia strives as well to be a major factor of stability for the new international order in this part of Europe.

In closing, I would like to emphasize that the Republic of Croatia has always looked to the United States of America as the backbone of democracy and the pillar of the free and stable world and deeply appreciates its effort in this important step taken today.

Thank you.

President Clinton. Mr. Zubak.

Mr. Kresimir Zubak. Mr. President, ladies and gentleman. Croatian people in Bosnia-Herzegovina are of the opinion that this senseless war in Bosnia-Herzegovina must cease. Croatian people want to organize Bosnia-Herzegovina as a free democratic modern state community where equal people live. Our people have accepted the peace initiative, which with a contribution from European Union was started by United States of America.

Signing these documents today, we accept the responsibility to that which was negotiated during the negotiations—to implement that which was negotiated. And we will work towards organizing the federation of Bosnia-Herzegovina as soon as possible. And we will also strive to organize the confederation with the Republic of Croatia as soon as possible.

I thank you, Mr. President, all your colleagues, for the help that you have extended to us so far. And I express hope that you will help us to organize the state community and the whole territory, and also that you will help us to stop the war in the territory of Bosnia-Herzegovina, and that you will also

help us in reconstructing the war and life in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

Thank you once again.

President Clinton. Ladies and gentlemen, today we have witnessed an act of great statesmanship. Now we must hope that the courage embodied by these agreements will inspire further acts of reason, reconstruction and progress to implement them, to make them real in the lives of the people whose leaders are represented here today.

We also must hope, I will say again, that the Serbs will join in this effort for a wider peace. We invite them and urge them to do so.

Over 150 years ago, the Balkan poet, Ivan Jukic, wrote the following line, “Only those are heroes who know how to live with their brothers.” Let us hope we are beginning to learn that lesson in this troubled land.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9 a.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Kresimir Zubak, representative of the Bosnian Croats; Greek Foreign Minister Karolos Papoulias, Belgian Foreign Minister Willy Claes, and German Foreign Minister Klaus Kinkel, representing European Union Troika; Lord David Owen and Thorvald Stoltenberg, Cochairmen, International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia; Cyrus Vance, former Cochairman of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia; and Ambassador Charles Redman, U.S. Special Envoy for the Former Yugoslavia. Foreign Minister Papoulias spoke in Greek, President Izetbegovic spoke in Bosniac, and Mr. Zubak spoke in Croatian, and their remarks were translated by an interpreter.

Statement on Earthquake Assistance to California

March 18, 1994

The people of southern California are responding courageously to the challenge of restoring their lives and their communities in the wake of the earthquake. From the first day, our administration has been working extremely hard to fulfill the Federal Government's obligation to help make that possible.

This new assistance reflects new costs that have come to our attention in recent weeks. My administration is continuing to monitor

the situation, and we will continue to provide the necessary assistance as additional needs become evident.

NOTE: This statement was part of a White House press release on the release of emergency funds for California earthquake recovery and other recent disasters.

**Proclamation 6657—National
Agriculture Day, 1994**
March 18, 1994

*By the President of the United States
of America*

A Proclamation

The early days of spring mark the time when nature quickens its pace from winter to begin another season of vigorous growth. A green carpet of emerging leaves and sprouting crops unfolds from the shores of the Gulf of Mexico across the rest of this great land, as the advancing springtime Sun gently warms the Earth. We Americans owe much to this annual season of renewal, and citizens around the world join with us in eager anticipation of our land's rich harvest.

Our Nation's 20 million farmers, farmworkers, harvesters, processors, shippers, marketers, retailers, and equipment providers help to sustain our country's reputation as the breadbasket of the Earth. In 1992, American agriculture accounted for 18.5 percent of international agricultural trade, reflecting the quality and productivity that has made our produce the finest in the world. Hard-working Americans have long helped to place food on the tables of the hungry. Last year alone, the United States donated over \$2 billion worth of food aid to those in need around the globe.

In addition to meeting the demands of the planet's vast population, our prodigious agricultural team contributes much to our national life, creating jobs and shaping the daily experiences of millions of Americans. Our Nation was built by farmers' steady hands, and we are forever indebted to these dedicated pioneers for their diligence and persistence.

National Agriculture Day is a celebration of the ongoing partnership between human-

ity and nature. Each day, we embrace new innovations in agricultural products and tools that widen consumer choice, create jobs, strengthen rural areas, and help to make the United States more competitive in the global economy. We express our deep appreciation to the agriculture community and, together, we hope for another bountiful season.

The Congress, by Senate Joint Resolution 163, has designated March 20, 1994, as "National Agriculture Day," and has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of this day.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim March 20, 1994, as National Agriculture Day. I call on the people of the United States to recognize the members of our national food and fiber team, whose hard work has helped our Nation to grow and prosper. I encourage all Americans to show their appreciation for our plentiful and dependable food supplies through appropriate ceremonies and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this eighteenth day of March, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-four, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and eighteenth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 12:08 p.m., March 21, 1994]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on March 23.

**Statement by Director of
Communications on the President's
Telephone Conversations With
President Hafiz al-Asad of Syria and
King Hussein of Jordan**
March 18, 1994

President Clinton called President Hafiz al-Asad of Syria and King Hussein of Jordan this afternoon to discuss developments in the Middle East peace process. President Asad informed the President that he had consulted with the leaders of Syria, Jordan, and Lebanon and that they had agreed that bilateral peace process negotiations with Israel would

resume in April. President Asad noted that the Arab leaders took this decision in the context of their support for the U.N. Security Council resolution on Hebron and to enhance efforts to improve the security of the Palestinians and to advance the overall negotiating process toward a comprehensive and lasting peace.

King Hussein expressed his support for the resumption of negotiations and his hopes for progress. President Clinton noted that the United States would be consulting with the Russian peace process cosponsor to determine a specific date in April for negotiations to begin.

The President has also welcomed the intensive Israeli-Palestinian contacts which are taking place, including discussions today between Chairman Arafat and Prime Minister Rabin. A senior-level Israel-PLO meeting will take place in the coming days and will be announced shortly by the parties.

Digest of Other White House Announcements

The following list includes the President's public schedule and other items of general interest announced by the Office of the Press Secretary and not included elsewhere in this issue.

March 13

In the afternoon, the President had a telephone conversation with President Hafiz al-Asad of Syria from Air Force One as he traveled to Detroit, MI. In the late afternoon, the President toured the Advance Technology Center at Focus: HOPE.

March 14

In the morning, the President had coffee with Group of Seven Foreign Ministers at the Westin Hotel.

In the afternoon, the President toured the assembly line at Detroit Diesel. In the late afternoon, he traveled to Boston, MA.

In the evening, the President traveled to Nashua, NH, where he remained overnight.

March 15

In the morning, the President traveled to Keene, NH.

In the afternoon, the President toured the Markem Corp. Following a visit to the town square, the President traveled to Ft. Drum, NY.

In the evening, the President met with military personnel who recently returned from Somalia and their families at the home of Ft. Drum Base Commander Gen. David C. Mead. The President returned to Washington, DC, later that evening.

March 16

In the morning, the President met with officers of the National League of Cities. He then met with representatives from Boy Scouts of America.

The President declared a major disaster exists in Kentucky and ordered Federal funds be released to help communities in the State recover from winter storms which occurred from February 9 to 11.

The President also declared a major disaster exists in Delaware and Maryland and ordered Federal funds be released to help communities in those States recover from severe ice storms and flooding which occurred from February 8 to 18.

The President announced his intention to nominate William T. Coleman as General Counsel for the U.S. Army.

March 17

In the afternoon, the President and Prime Minister Albert Reynolds of Ireland went to Capitol Hill where they attended a St. Patrick's Day luncheon hosted by Speaker of the House Thomas Foley.

The White House announced that in the afternoon the President had telephone conversations with President Hosni Mubarak of Egypt and President Hafiz al-Asad of Syria to discuss the Middle East peace process.

The White House announced the withdrawal of the nomination of Stephen J. Solarz to be U.S. Ambassador to India and that the President asked him to serve as the President's Special Representative on Sudan.

The White House announced the appointment of Thomas B. Ross as Special Assistant to the President, Senior Director for Public

Affairs at the National Security Council, and Deputy White House Press Secretary.

March 18

The President named Susan Hammer, Fu-Tong Hsu, Bernard Rapoport, Jack Sheinkman, and Paula Stern to the Advisory Committee for Trade Policy and Negotiations.

The President announced his intent to nominate A.J. Eggenberger for reappointment as Vice Chair to the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) and Herbert John Cecil Kouts as a member to the Board.

The White House announced the appointment of Stanley Roth as Special Assistant to the President and Senior Director for Asian Affairs, Sandra Kristoff as Special Assistant to the President and Senior Director for Asia-Pacific Economic Affairs, and Robert L. Suettinger as Director for Asian Affairs at the National Security Council.

The White House announced the President has appointed Matthew Nimetz to serve as his Special Envoy to assist the United Nations' efforts to resolve the differences between Greece and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

Nominations Submitted to the Senate

The following list does not include promotions of members of the Uniformed Services, nominations to the Service Academies, or nominations of Foreign Service officers.

Submitted March 16

William T. Coleman III, of Michigan, to be General Counsel of the Department of the Army, vice William James Haynes II, resigned.

Sara E. Lister, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army, vice Robert S. Silberman, resigned.

Rudy deLeon, of California, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force, vice Anne Newman Foreman, resigned.

Submitted March 17

Gilbert F. Decker, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army, vice Stephen Kay Conver, resigned.

Jeffrey K. Harris, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, vice Martin C. Faga.

Checklist of White House Press Releases

The following list contains releases of the Office of the Press Secretary that are neither printed as items nor covered by entries in the Digest of Other White House Announcements.

Released March 15

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the President's decision to extend the moratorium on nuclear testing by the United States through September 1995

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the transmittal to Congress of fiscal year 1995 budget amendments related to reform of Federal procurement

Released March 16

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the transmittal to Congress of fiscal year 1995 budget amendments related to reduced rental payment by Federal agencies to the General Services Administration

Fact sheet on the "Reemployment Act of 1994"

Released March 17

Statement by Director of Communications Mark Gearan on National Security Adviser Anthony Lake's meeting with Kalala-Mbenga Kalao, editor of *La Tempete de Tropiques* in Zaire

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers announcing that the President will host the Bosnian Federation signing ceremony on March 18

White House statement announcing Senior Adviser for Policy and Strategy George Stephanopoulos' intention to testify before the Grand Jury led by Special Prosecutor Robert Fiske

Released March 18

Fact sheet on the Bosnian Federation signing ceremony

**Acts Approved
by the President**

Approved March 17

S. 1789 / Public Law 103-220

To amend title 23, United States Code, to permit the use of funds under the highway bridge replacement and rehabilitation program for seismic retrofit of bridges, and for other purposes